



32101 076199221



*Restored through
a grant from*

The Cartwright Foundation



TRANSACTIONS
AND
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN
PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1921

VOLUME LII

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
ADELBERT COLLEGE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LII

TRANSACTIONS

I. The Character of the Latin Accent	5
E. H. STURTEVANT	
II. The Speaker and the Hearer	16
WALTER PETERSEN	
III. Richard Bentley's Critical Notes on Arrian's <i>Discourses of Epictetus</i>	
WILLIAM ABBOTT OLDFATHER	
IV. Literary Reminiscences in the <i>Agricola</i>	53
CLARENCE W. MENDELL	
V. On a Fragment of Greek Comedy Attributed to Me- nander	69
FRANCIS G. ALLINSON	
VI. Two Contracts for Division of Property from Graeco- Roman Egypt	82
A. E. R. BOAK	
VII. The Carrière of the Higher Roman Officials in Egypt in the Second Century	96
SUSAN H. BALLOU	
VIII. A Papyrus Describing Magical Powers	111
CAMPBELL BONNER	
IX. Thericles, Potter, in the Light of the Greek Drama . .	119
WALTER MILLER	
X. The Function of the Homeric Simile	132
SAMUEL E. BASSETT	
XI. The <i>Priapea</i> and the Vergilian Appendix	148
ROBERT S. RADFORD	

260
270
280
290
300
310
320
330
340
350
360
370
380
390
400
410
420
430
440
450
460
470
480
490
500
510
520
530
540
550
560
570
580
590
600
610
620
630
640
650
660
670
680
690
700
710
720
730
740
750
760
770
780
790
800
810
820
830
840
850
860
870
880
890
900
910
920
930
940
950
960
970
980
990
1000
1010
1020
1030
1040
1050
1060
1070
1080
1090
1100
1110
1120
1130
1140
1150
1160
1170
1180
1190
1200
1210
1220
1230
1240
1250
1260
1270
1280
1290
1300
1310
1320
1330
1340
1350
1360
1370
1380
1390
1400
1410
1420
1430
1440
1450
1460
1470
1480
1490
1500
1510
1520
1530
1540
1550
1560
1570
1580
1590
1600
1610
1620
1630
1640
1650
1660
1670
1680
1690
1700
1710
1720
1730
1740
1750
1760
1770
1780
1790
1800
1810
1820
1830
1840
1850
1860
1870
1880
1890
1900
1910
1920
1930
1940
1950
1960
1970
1980
1990
2000
2010
2020
2030
2040
2050
2060
2070
2080
2090
2100
2110
2120
2130
2140
2150
2160
2170
2180
2190
2200
2210
2220
2230
2240
2250
2260
2270
2280
2290
2300
2310
2320
2330
2340
2350
2360
2370
2380
2390
2400
2410
2420
2430
2440
2450
2460
2470
2480
2490
2500
2510
2520
2530
2540
2550
2560
2570
2580
2590
2600
2610
2620
2630
2640
2650
2660
2670
2680
2690
2700
2710
2720
2730
2740
2750
2760
2770
2780
2790
2800
2810
2820
2830
2840
2850
2860
2870
2880
2890
2900
2910
2920
2930
2940
2950
2960
2970
2980
2990
3000
3010
3020
3030
3040
3050
3060
3070
3080
3090
3100
3110
3120
3130
3140
3150
3160
3170
3180
3190
3200
3210
3220
3230
3240
3250
3260
3270
3280
3290
3300
3310
3320
3330
3340
3350
3360
3370
3380
3390
3400
3410
3420
3430
3440
3450
3460
3470
3480
3490
3500
3510
3520
3530
3540
3550
3560
3570
3580
3590
3600
3610
3620
3630
3640
3650
3660
3670
3680
3690
3700
3710
3720
3730
3740
3750
3760
3770
3780
3790
3800
3810
3820
3830
3840
3850
3860
3870
3880
3890
3900
3910
3920
3930
3940
3950
3960
3970
3980
3990
4000
4010
4020
4030
4040
4050
4060
4070
4080
4090
4010
4020
4030
4040
4050
4060
4070
4080
4090
4100
4110
4120
4130
4140
4150
4160
4170
4180
4190
4200
4210
4220
4230
4240
4250
4260
4270
4280
4290
4300
4310
4320
4330
4340
4350
4360
4370
4380
4390
4400
4410
4420
4430
4440
4450
4460
4470
4480
4490
4500
4510
4520
4530
4540
4550
4560
4570
4580
4590
4600
4610
4620
4630
4640
4650
4660
4670
4680
4690
4700
4710
4720
4730
4740
4750
4760
4770
4780
4790
4800
4810
4820
4830
4840
4850
4860
4870
4880
4890
4900
4910
4920
4930
4940
4950
4960
4970
4980
4990
5000
5010
5020
5030
5040
5050
5060
5070
5080
5090
5010
5020
5030
5040
5050
5060
5070
5080
5090
5100
5110
5120
5130
5140
5150
5160
5170
5180
5190
5110
5120
5130
5140
5150
5160
5170
5180
5190
5200
5210
5220
5230
5240
5250
5260
5270
5280
5290
5210
5220
5230
5240
5250
5260
5270
5280
5290
5300
5310
5320
5330
5340
5350
5360
5370
5380
5390
5310
5320
5330
5340
5350
5360
5370
5380
5390
5400
5410
5420
5430
5440
5450
5460
5470
5480
5490
5410
5420
5430
5440
5450
5460
5470
5480
5490
5500
5510
5520
5530
5540
5550
5560
5570
5580
5590
5510
5520
5530
5540
5550
5560
5570
5580
5590
5600
5610
5620
5630
5640
5650
5660
5670
5680
5690
5610
5620
5630
5640
5650
5660
5670
5680
5690
5700
5710
5720
5730
5740
5750
5760
5770
5780
5790
5710
5720
5730
5740
5750
5760
5770
5780
5790
5800
5810
5820
5830
5840
5850
5860
5870
5880
5890
5810
5820
5830
5840
5850
5860
5870
5880
5890
5900
5910
5920
5930
5940
5950
5960
5970
5980
5990
5910
5920
5930
5940
5950
5960
5970
5980
5990
6000
6010
6020
6030
6040
6050
6060
6070
6080
6090
6010
6020
6030
6040
6050
6060
6070
6080
6090
6100
6110
6120
6130
6140
6150
6160
6170
6180
6190
6110
6120
6130
6140
6150
6160
6170
6180
6190
6200
6210
6220
6230
6240
6250
6260
6270
6280
6290
6210
6220
6230
6240
6250
6260
6270
6280
6290
6300
6310
6320
6330
6340
6350
6360
6370
6380
6390
6310
6320
6330
6340
6350
6360
6370
6380
6390
6400
6410
6420
6430
6440
6450
6460
6470
6480
6490
6410
6420
6430
6440
6450
6460
6470
6480
6490
6500
6510
6520
6530
6540
6550
6560
6570
6580
6590
6510
6520
6530
6540
6550
6560
6570
6580
6590
6600
6610
6620
6630
6640
6650
6660
6670
6680
6690
6610
6620
6630
6640
6650
6660
6670
6680
6690
6700
6710
6720
6730
6740
6750
6760
6770
6780
6790
6710
6720
6730
6740
6750
6760
6770
6780
6790
6800
6810
6820
6830
6840
6850
6860
6870
6880
6890
6810
6820
6830
6840
6850
6860
6870
6880
6890
6900
6910
6920
6930
6940
6950
6960
6970
6980
6990
6910
6920
6930
6940
6950
6960
6970
6980
6990
7000
7010
7020
7030
7040
7050
7060
7070
7080
7090
7010
7020
7030
7040
7050
7060
7070
7080
7090
7100
7110
7120
7130
7140
7150
7160
7170
7180
7190
7110
7120
7130
7140
7150
7160
7170
7180
7190
7200
7210
7220
7230
7240
7250
7260
7270
7280
7290
7210
7220
7230
7240
7250
7260
7270
7280
7290
7300
7310
7320
7330
7340
7350
7360
7370
7380
7390
7310
7320
7330
7340
7350
7360
7370
7380
7390
7400
7410
7420
7430
7440
7450
7460
7470
7480
7490
7410
7420
7430
7440
7450
7460
7470
7480
7490
7500
7510
7520
7530
7540
7550
7560
7570
7580
7590
7510
7520
7530
7540
7550
7560
7570
7580
7590
7600
7610
7620
7630
7640
7650
7660
7670
7680
7690
7610
7620
7630
7640
7650
7660
7670
7680
7690
7700
7710
7720
7730
7740
7750
7760
7770
7780
7790
7710
7720
7730
7740
7750
7760
7770
7780
7790
7800
7810
7820
7830
7840
7850
7860
7870
7880
7890
7810
7820
7830
7840
7850
7860
7870
7880
7890
7900
7910
7920
7930
7940
7950
7960
7970
7980
7990
7910
7920
7930
7940
7950
7960
7970
7980
7990
8000
8010
8020
8030
8040
8050
8060
8070
8080
8090
8010
8020
8030
8040
8050
8060
8070
8080
8090
8100
8110
8120
8130
8140
8150
8160
8170
8180
8190
8110
8120
8130
8140
8150
8160
8170
8180
8190
8200
8210
8220
8230
8240
8250
8260
8270
8280
8290
8210
8220
8230
8240
8250
8260
8270
8280
8290
8300
8310
8320
8330
8340
8350
8360
8370
8380
8390
8310
8320
8330
8340
8350
8360
8370
8380
8390
8400
8410
8420
8430
8440
8450
8460
8470
8480
8490
8410
8420
8430
8440
8450
8460
8470
8480
8490
8500
8510
8520
8530
8540
8550
8560
8570
8580
8590
8510
8520
8530
8540
8550
8560
8570
8580
8590
8

PROCEEDINGS

I. Programme of the Fifty-third Annual Meeting, Ann Arbor, 1921	i
II. Minutes	v
III. Abstracts	xvii
1. An Epigraphic Forgery	xvii
FRANCIS W. KELSEY	
2. Post-Mortem Wit in Folk Tale, Literature, and Roman Law	xvii
DEAN C. LOCKWOOD	
3. Crinagoras and his Epigrams	xviii
HENRY W. PRESCOTT	
4. The Interest in the <i>Aeneid</i> , Ancient and Modern .	xix
R. B. STEELE	
I. Programme of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	xx
II. Minutes	xxii
Index to Articles and Abstracts	xxv
Bibliographical Record for the year 1921	xxvii
Officers of the Association	xl
Officers of the Association of the Pacific Coast	xl
Members, List of	xli
Constitution	lxv
Committees and Business Matters	lxvii
Publications of the Association	lxix

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1921

I. — *The Character of the Latin Accent*

BY DR. E. H. STURTEVANT

EDGEWATER, N. J.

FOR a long time scholars have been aware of an apparent conflict between two parts of the evidence on the nature of the Latin accent. Certain vowel changes unmistakably indicate a stress accent. The familiar weakening of vowels in other than initial syllables (*recipio* beside *capio*, *receptus* beside *captus*, *distineo* beside *teneo*, etc.) is valid evidence for a prehistoric stress accent on the initial syllable of the word. Syncope of short vowels, as in *fac* beside *cape*, *infra* beside *inferus*, etc., is also evidence for a prehistoric stress accent resting on initial syllables. A few cases of weakening and syncope seem to be due to the historic accent on penult or antepenult, indicating that this also was a stress accent. Of much greater importance is the 'iambic shortening' of long vowels and syllables; for this is clearly due to the historic accent, which must therefore have been a stress accent.

The Romans themselves, on the other hand, have left us several careful descriptions of their accent and a great number of more or less casual remarks about it. Up to the close of the fourth century A.D. they consistently and unmistakably describe the accent as one of pitch. Furthermore the strict observance of quantity in Latin verse and the conflict of ictus and accent have seemed to many scholars cogent evidence of a pitch rather than a stress accent. 5

Some years ago Professor Abbott (*Class. Phil.* II, 444-460) suggested that the apparently conflicting evidence might be harmonized on the assumption that the stress accent of early Latin gave way to a pitch accent in the formal Latin of the classical period, while stress continued to characterize the popular speech. In speaking about their language, the Romans usually refer to formal Latin, while the linguistic phenomena indicating a stress accent, Professor Abbott thought, were "characteristic of, if not peculiar to, popular Latin." The strict observance of quantity, furthermore, he regarded as peculiar to literature and therefore as evidence for the accent of formal Latin.

An additional point in favor of the theory was that it explained away the troublesome conflict of accent and ictus in classical poetry; if accent was merely pitch the field was free for a stressed ictus coinciding with the time-beats. In other words, Latin poetry would have no more conflict than Greek between accent and ictus.

In *T.A.P.A.* XLII, 45-52, I proposed another way of harmonizing the two classes of evidence, on the ground that Latin had an accent which combined a considerable variation of pitch with a considerable variation of stress. This suggestion has been repeated in my *Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, 206-218. I come back to the matter now chiefly for two reasons. I desire to show the bearing upon this question of some investigations of mine, and, in the second place, the recent adherence to Professor Abbott's theory of a leading American student of Latin pronunciation (Professor Kent, *T.A.P.A.* LI, 19-29) brings the matter again into prominence.

The evidence on which the theory is based appears to me altogether illusory. Syncope was chiefly due to the prehistoric accent, and so, for the most part, antedated the division between formal and popular Latin. We must suppose that both full and syncopated forms were in use in early times, and that popular Latin generally preserved the syncopated forms and formal Latin more frequently the full forms. The

distinction is by no means sharp, as is shown by *puertiae* in Horace, *balneum* in Cicero and Horace, *caldus*, which Octavian recommended to his grandson on the ground that *calidus* was “*otiosus*,” and many other syncopated forms in good use. But it is not worth while to press the point, since the syncope of these words, being of prehistoric origin, has no bearing whatever on the accent of classical Latin.

Of greater significance is the fact that at least one word syncopated by the historic accent belonged to approved colloquial speech. Quintilian says (I, 6, 21): *Multum enim litteratus qui . . . calefacere dixerit potius quam quod dicimus.* Since *calefacere* could not suffer syncope until shortened by the iambic law, this seems to indicate that the historic stress accent and its effects were not foreign to the familiar speech of educated persons.

In this connection I would cite an interesting passage from Cicero, *de Or.* III, 12, 45: *Equidem cum audio socrum meam Laeliam — facilius enim mulieres incorruptam antiquitatem conservant, quod multorum sermonis expertes ea tenent semper quae prima didicerunt — sed eam sic audio ut Plautum mihi aut Naevium videar audire.*

Since accent is the very soul of speech, we may be sure that in Cicero's opinion aristocratic ladies used the same sort of accent as was proper in reading Plautus and Terence. Now, if Professor Abbott's theory were correct, Cicero would have known well enough that both language and verse of Plautus and Terence demanded the stress accent; both the syncope which abounds in those authors and the nearly constant harmony of accent and ictus would have called for the accent of popular Latin rather than of formal Latin, in the opinion of Cicero and his contemporaries.

These two scraps of evidence seem to show that the *sermo cotidianus* of the upper classes had a stress accent. Shall we, then, suppose that Vergil ordinarily spoke with a stress accent, but discarded it for pitch when he composed hexameters? Did Cicero use a stress accent in dictating his letters and

philosophical works, which are in the *sermo cotidianus*, but employ a pitch accent when he addressed the people — who, by hypothesis, always spoke with a stress accent?

Conversely, the strict observance of quantity cannot be confined to formal literature. That popular Latin preserved clear-cut distinctions of quantity after the introduction of the historic accent on penult and antepenult, is shown by the verse of Plautus and Terence. The prosody of the early dramatists is in some respects different from that of Vergil, but it is scarcely less rigorous, except in the matter of iambic shortening; and this process is so narrowly limited that it should not be thought of as a relaxation of the laws of quantity but rather as a modification of them.

Popular speech preserved the accurate distinction of quantity in accented syllables to a much later date, and when such distinctions finally broke down, the qualitative differences which had accompanied them remained. Hence the Romance languages show different developments of long and short accented vowels (e.g., Ital. *miele* from *mēl* but *vero* from *vērum*). Furthermore, quantity persisted in certain unaccented penultimate vowels until the late Vulgar Latin shift of accent to these vowels. Hence Ital. *moglie* correctly records the quantity of *e* in the penult of *mulierem*. It appears, then, that popular Latin was in accord with Latin verse in its strict observance of quantity; if quantity furnishes evidence of pitch in one it does so in both.

Professor Abbott's theory requires the assumption that the pitch accent of Indo-European became a stress accent in Italic and remained such in Latin until about the beginning of the literature, or a little later. Then stress gave way to pitch in formal Latin for five or six hundred years, and finally regained its predominance by 400 A.D. Such an oscillation is possible, of course; but one wants pretty strong evidence before accepting it as a fact.

In particular, some explanation is needed of the relapse of formal Latin from stress to pitch accent, while popular

Latin retained its stress. The explanation is found, Professor Abbott thinks, in the influence of Greek upon Latin literature. This idea is rather prominent both in Professor Abbott's and in Professor Kent's discussion, and it seems worth while to refute it in some detail.

The persistence of one's native accent in one's pronunciation of a foreign language is familiar enough. In fact it has been suggested that some of the historic changes of accent were brought about in this way. Possibly the Indo-European pitch accent gave way to the stress of Celtic, Germanic, and Italic when Indo-European speech was adopted by great numbers of westerners whose native languages had heavy stress. That is to say, the primitive language of Italy, for example, may have had a stress accent, and this may be the reason why, when they learned Indo-European, the Italic peoples spoke it with a stress accent.

In the present instance we are asked to believe that the reverse of this has taken place, that educated Romans imported into their pronunciation of their own language the accent of a foreign language. It would be difficult to find a parallel for such a development. Just how improbable the theory is will appear from a moment's reflection.

We in America frequently hear English pronounced more or less in the manner of German, French, Slavic, Japanese, and so on. Particularly in point is the occasional sing-song of Chinese or Swedish English. Just so the Greek pronunciation of Latin was familiar in Rome on the lips of Greek artisans and slaves, and of the disreputable mob to whom Juvenal applied the epithet *Graeculus esuriens*. The use of Greek expletives and slang in Plautus and Terence (*eu*, *euge*, *Hercole*, *dica* 'lawsuit,' *πάλιν* *Trin.* 705, *badisso* 'go' *Asin.* 706) is clearly a reflection of familiar usage in the polyglot capital. Sometimes the absurdity that always attaches to such foreign tags is quite evident; as where Stasimus, *Trin.* 419, says *argentum οἴχεται*, or where Ergasilus, *Capt.* 881 ff., swears *ναὶ τὰν Κόπαν* and continues with *ναὶ τὰν Πραινέστην*, *ναὶ τὰν*

Σιγνίαν, etc. In the latter passage the non-Attic *τάν* of course follows the pronunciation of a very large proportion of the Greeks in Rome. Quintilian tells (I, 4, 14) how Cicero once made fun of a Greek witness who could not pronounce Latin *f*. Petronius satirizes the mispronunciation of Latin by Greek freedmen and slaves, and in two passages (59 and 68) he seems to refer to the use of the Greek musical accent in reciting Latin.¹ The second passage is particularly significant for us, since it concerns the recitation of Vergil with pitch accent. The italicized words are the ones that suggest sing-song: *Servus qui ad pedes Habinnae . . . sedebat proclamavit subito canora voce*:

Interea medium Aeneas iam classe tenebat.

Nullus sonus umquam *acidior* percussit aures meas; nam praeter *errantis barbariae* aut *adiectum* aut *deminutum clamorem* miscebat Atellanicos versus, ut tunc primum me etiam Vergilius offenderit.

We are asked to believe that this absurd foreign pronunciation of Latin was adopted for use in serious literature! As well suppose that British or American enthusiasts over French literature would say 'zees peen' for 'this pin' or would use 'he' and 'she' in place of 'it'! Language mixture is common, but this particular kind of language mixture rarely occurs and probably never spreads beyond a few erratic and foolish speakers. In particular, we cannot suppose that the writer of a Roman national epic would make use of an accent which was familiar to all Romans as a mark of the most numerous and therefore the most despised group of foreigners in the Subura.

Ennius' efforts to create an epic dialect for Latin furnish no parallel for the assumed adoption of the Greek accent. Ennius tried to imitate certain features of Homeric Greek, which were as unfamiliar on the streets of Athens as of Rome.

¹ See Frank, *Class. Quart.* IV (1910), 35. His argument now seems to me more convincing than when I referred to it in *T.A.P.A.* XLII, 49.

The Greek words he borrowed are words of a literary flavor, quite different from the Greek oaths and everyday expressions which Plautus and Terence got direct from the Greek inhabitants of Rome. The 'tmesis' of the famous *saxo cere-communuit-brum* was intended to imitate Homeric 'tmesis,' and this was as different from spoken Greek as from spoken Latin in Ennius' day. When Ennius borrowed a Greek termination, it was the epic *-oio* (Mettioeo Fufettioeo). The whole aim of Ennius and his successors was to get away from familiar speech, and the adoption of certain features of Greek literature helped in this; but the effect of using the Greek pitch accent would have been quite the reverse.

The normal Roman attitude toward foreign speech appears in Cicero, *de Oratore*, III, 44: *Quare cum sit quaedam certa vox Romani generis urbisque propria, in qua nihil offendi, nihil displicere, nihil animadverti possit, nihil sonare aut olere peregrinum, hanc sequamur neque solum rusticam asperitatem sed etiam peregrinam insolentiam fugere discamus.*

The theory of a different accent for popular and for formal Latin raises also a troublesome question of date. If we are to be saved the difficulty of a clash between ictus and accent in the Latin hexameter, we must suppose that the pitch accent was introduced into formal Latin at least as early as the time of Ennius; for his hexameters are not essentially different in this respect from those of Vergil (see *Class. Phil.* xiv, 234-285). Professor Abbott (pp. 452, 455) seems, as a matter of fact, to include Ennius' Latin in that which was subject to the pitch accent. It is peculiarly difficult to believe, however, that a predominantly pitch accent could have developed so early. It is quite impossible that Hellenic influence could have modified the language to any great extent by that time. Even educated Romans were still content to make *p*, *t*, and *c* out of Greek *φ*, *θ*, and *χ*, while *v* was regularly represented by Latin *u*, and *ξ* by Latin *s* or *ss*. At any rate Horace's "Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit" cannot be applied to the period; for Greece was not yet captured!

Almost equally difficult is the supposition that pitch took the place of stress at this early date, by spontaneous development, in one type of the Latin language but not in others. Before Ennius there was scarcely a distinction between formal and popular Latin. There were no doubt some differences of vocabulary dependent upon the audience and the occasion, while some few words may have been confined to the upper classes and certain others to the poorest and meanest citizens. But there was no sharp cleft in the language such as would make a divergent development in accent understandable.

Professor Kent, on the other hand, places the development of the pitch accent about 100 B.C., by which time Hellenic influence was about as strong as it ever became. One wonders how he would account for the clash of accent and ictus in Ennius.

Clearly there are some serious objections to be urged against the theory of a different accent for formal and for popular Latin. If the facts it was intended to explain can be otherwise satisfactorily accounted for, it will fall of its own weight. They can, I think, be accounted for in the way mentioned above. The Romans themselves tell us that their accent was one of pitch, and certain linguistic changes of Latin clearly indicate a stress accent. There is no difficulty in assuming that both kinds of evidence apply to the same accent, which was at once a pitch accent and a stress accent. Most accents combine these two elements, and, if we suppose that the Latin accent combined them in nearly equal proportions, all the requirements of our problem are fully met.

Positive proof that the accent of formal Latin contained a considerable element of stress comes from a study of the differences in technique between Greek and Latin hexameters. It appears that when the Roman poets departed from the practice of their Greek models they did so to accommodate the Greek measures to the Latin accent. My demonstra-

tion (*C.P.* xiv, 234–244) that this was the case with Plautus and Terence need not be reviewed, because their accent is not here under discussion.

It has long been recognized that Latin hexameters differ markedly from Greek hexameters in two respects. In Greek there is no observable relationship between accent and ictus, while in Latin there is usually conflict of accent and ictus in the first four feet of the verse and harmony in the last two. In the second place, there are some striking differences in the position of word-ends and sense-pauses — the phenomena which have usually been vaguely grouped under the term 'caesura.' I have shown (*Class. Phil.* xiv, 373–385, *A.J.P.* XLII, 289–308) that the clash of accent and ictus in the first four feet and the harmony in the last two feet were not accidental, but were sought after by the poets, and that this effort to secure a certain relationship of accent and ictus led to the observed changes in the position of word-ends and sense-pauses.

The argument is briefly this: —

1. There are certain words which can be used in hexameters only with clash of accent and ictus (*e.g.*, *ferunt*), and certain others which can be used only with harmony of accent and ictus (*e.g.*, *mittere*). Now words of these two types form respectively 19.59% and 18.29% of the ordinary prose vocabulary. In the first four feet of the hexameter words requiring clash form about 26.63% of all words employed and those requiring harmony form only about 9.22%. In the last two feet, on the contrary, words requiring clash form only about 2.52% of all words employed and those requiring harmony comprise nearly half of the entire vocabulary, namely 45.60%.

2. Words consisting wholly of long syllables may be employed either with clash or with harmony of accent and ictus. Such words occur in both parts of the verse more frequently than in prose, and especially in the last two feet. With very few exceptions these words, if employed in the last two feet, are so placed as to produce harmony. For the first part of

the verse the evidence for manipulation is not quite so clear. Words of the rhythmic type — σ have the ictus on the penult, on the average, only a little more than half as often as syllable groups of the same rhythm, and we must therefore assume that the poets constructed this part of the verse so as to avoid harmony of accent and ictus on spondaic words. A similar tendency is not observable in regard to longer words consisting wholly of long syllables, but of course the longer words are very much less common.

3. The chief differences between the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* in the position of word-ends are these. In the *Aeneid* word-ends are much rarer than in the *Iliad* after the first short syllable of the first and third feet and after the first syllable of the fifth foot, while they are much more frequent after the first syllable of the third and fourth feet and at the close of the fifth foot. All of these remarkable variations may be fully explained by the attempt to secure clash of accent and ictus in the first four feet and harmony of accent and ictus in the last two feet; for a word-end after the first syllable of a foot involves ictus on the ultima, while a word-end after the first short syllable or at the end of the foot ordinarily throws the ictus upon accented penult or antepenult.

4. Similarly the Latin hexameter shows a distribution of sense-pauses very different from that of the Greek hexameter. Certain sense-pauses are favored and certain others are avoided in such a way as to produce clash in the first four feet and harmony in the last two. Furthermore Greek hexameters show a clear technique of sense-pauses, and this is largely neglected by the Roman poets, probably because the Latin hexameter, with its required attention to accent, was so much more difficult to compose than the Greek that the rigors of technique had to be relaxed at some points.

Now, the Roman poets would not have gone to such great pains to correlate accent and ictus — and that in violation of Greek precedent — if accent and ictus had not had enough similarity to demand such treatment. Ictus can scarcely

have been a matter of pitch, since the Greek pitch accent had no effect upon it. It has been held that Latin verse was merely a regular succession of long and short syllables, and that the mere quantitative predominance of one part of the foot set it off from the other part. To paraphrase for our present purpose, ictus has been identified with regularly recurring long quantity. But the Latin accent was not confined to long syllables. In fact we can find no possible common element for accent and ictus save stress. Therefore both accent and ictus must have involved stress.

This demonstration goes beyond the thesis, and touches upon another disputed point, namely, the nature of the ictus. There is a considerable amount of evidence on this question, and, in my opinion, it all harmonizes with the bit here presented. I hope to discuss the ictus of classical verse in the near future. At that time I shall have to explain the apparent anomaly of intentional clash of accent and ictus in the first four feet of the hexameter. For the present I merely refer to the articles, mentioned above, from which the last eight paragraphs have, in the main, been abridged.

II. — *The Speaker and the Hearer*

BY PROFESSOR WALTER PETERSEN

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE

THAT language is a social product, which presupposes both the speaker and the hearer, is a linguistic commonplace, the acceptance of which in theory is self-evident. Nevertheless it is equally true that in discussions of individual problems and in explanations of individual linguistic phenomena the hearer is almost completely ignored even at the present time. Cf., e.g., Oertel, *Lectures on the Study of Language*, 237, Carnoy, *T.A.P.A.* XLIX, 110, Ph. Wegener, *I.F.* XXXIX, 1 ff. The latter asserts that the psychologist Wundt slighted the part of the hearer in language changes even more than Paul in his much earlier *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*.

The object of this article is not, however, to discuss the part of the hearer in its entirety, nor to establish or review the different aspects of his influence on language as thoroughly as possible, but merely to take up some aspects of his influence, more particularly those changes which are due to the misinterpretation of the speaker by the hearer, who may then in his own speaking reproduce not what the earlier speaker actually said, but what the hearer thought he had said. It is a highly plausible cause, as we shall see later, either alone or in complication with other causes, for certain phonetic as well as morphological and semantic and syntactic changes.

That such misinterpretations give rise to bizarre ephemeral creations, which usually soon fall victims to the correction of others, is a well-known fact. As a particularly humorous example I quote the following from F. N. Scott in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, IX, 578: "Two children five years of age who were playing marbles on the sidewalk, were contending over some fine point in the game. Said

one to the other, 'I know just as much about marbles as you do.' The other, not catching the first part of the sentence, spoke up belligerently, and the following dialogue ensued: 'Who's a Yoo-doo?' 'You're a Yoo-doo.' 'You're another.' 'Yoo-doo!' 'Yoo-doo!' At this point the children were separated by their elders, but for several weeks 'yoo-doo' was in good standing in the neighborhood as a term of vituperation."

If such innovations do not differ so much from the correct way of speaking that they are weeded out, or if the causes of the misunderstanding are operative in such a large number of cases that the changes are adopted by a larger number of individuals, they, like other innovations, may become well-established forms and even supplant original forms and lead to imitation and the establishing of whole categories.

Changes of this kind, like other changes which begin in the mistakes of individuals, presuppose, at least for a time, the coexistence of the old and new form or usage. Consequently misinterpretation of the speaker by the hearer cannot be assumed to have played a part in universal changes like those sound changes which are called 'regular' or 'spontaneous,' such as the change of I. E. *o* to Germanic *a*, unless indeed it were found possible to show why a familiar phenomenon should suddenly become misinterpreted universally. It has repeatedly been assumed that such misinterpretation was due to the misunderstanding by the children of the adult language in the process of learning to speak, and the consequent substitution of what they thought they had heard. Thus Meillet, *Introduction*,³ 6 f., would assign the chief rôle in sound change to children, and yet at the same time seems to feel the difficulty involved in assuming that all children would misinterpret in the same way at the same time, as is shown by his vague and unconvincing reference to "deep causes which tend to appear among all children born of indigenous parents in the same place at a particular time." The reasons for not accepting to any appreciable extent the influ-

ence of children on linguistic changes which deviate from the original sufficiently to be observed and corrected¹ are convincingly stated by Meringer, *Aus dem Leben der Sprache*, 228 ff. Whatever the real cause of the perplexing 'regular' sound changes, they do not concern us as examples of misinterpretation by the hearer.

On the other hand, a well-known certain class of examples is found in language mixture, when those who learn a new language substitute for strange sounds and combinations of sounds those of their own language which are similar. In by far the larger number of instances this must be due to misunderstanding the sounds of the strange language rather than only to inability to reproduce what is correctly heard; for correct hearing of what is unfamiliar is practically impossible.² We need think only of the habitual substitution of the uvular or rolled alveolar *r* for the American cacuminal *r* in the English of Frenchmen or Germans as learned in America, in order to find plausible the hypothesis that the earliest characteristics of the Romance languages were due to substitution of native sounds for misunderstood Roman sounds, or that Prakrit owed its phonetic differences from Sanskrit largely to a similar influence of the native Dravidian tongues which it displaced.³ And what has happened here in the growth of entire languages is the same as what takes place in sound substitutions in individual borrowed words or groups of words, as when Greek final *-os* and *-ov* became *-us* and *-um* in words which Latin borrowed from the Greek, e.g. Lat. *pontus* = πόντος and *mālum* = Doric μᾶλον; similarly when Lat. *u* consonans appears as *β* or *ον* in Greek in

¹ This does not deny the influence of children on such changes as are too subtle for immediate detection and correction (cf., e.g., p. 31), nor does it deny that grosser changes occur in the language of individual children. These, however, are weeded out by their parents or continue only as individual peculiarities. Cf. Oertel, *op. cit.* 235 ff.

² Cf. Oertel, *op. cit.* 240 ff., on the difficulty of perceiving correctly the sounds of a foreign language.

³ Cf. *J.A.O.S.* xxxii, 421 ff.

words borrowed from Latin, *e.g.* Οὐεργίλιος or Βεργίλιος = *Vergilius*. Cf. Paul, *Principien*,³ 369 f., who, however, imputes an unnecessarily active part to the speaker's deficient "*Bewegungsgefühl*."

Equally clear is the misinterpretation of the speaker by the hearer when the latter associates the sound of the foreign words with words in his own language and reproduces them in accordance with his misunderstanding, *i.e.*, in so-called popular etymology, as when in English *asparagus* became *sparrow-grass*, or in popular German *unguentum Neopolitanum* became *umgewendeter Napoleon*. Cf. Wundt, *Sprachpsychologie*,³ 476 ff.

Does misinterpretation also play a part in any of the numerous other kinds of sound change, more particularly assimilation and dissimilation? For contact dissimilations I shall content myself with referring to the above-mentioned article of Albert J. Carnoy, "On the Real Nature of Dissimilation," *T.A.P.A.* XLIX, 101 ff. As to assimilation, no doubt such instances as are perfectly regular and affect every occurrence of a combination cannot be referred to wrong perception any more than the regular spontaneous sound changes. Except in case of language mixture, misunderstanding will affect only one word at a time, and while, for example, we could readily see how perceiving **regtus* as *rectus* might have led to pronouncing in the latter way if this were a sporadic occurrence of such a change, yet the existence of *junctus*: *jungo*, *actus*: *ago*, and other forms without exception involving the same change, forces us to seek for the cause in the speaker exclusively. On the other hand, in changes which affect only sporadic instances of combinations, we may often suspect that difficulty of perception either assisted in the change or was the principal cause. So particularly in distant assimilations as well as dissimilations; for the recurrence of similar or identical sounds in successive syllables is extremely hard to follow accurately, and it is just as easy, for example, to understand sounds that are merely

similar as identical (assimilation) as to understand as merely similar those which are identical (dissimilation). It is much easier to understand such assimilations as Rhodian *βόλιβος* < *μόλιβος*⁴ or Lat. *berbex* < *verbex*⁴ from the point of view of the hearer than of the speaker, without in the least denying that the subtle associations of the different sounds of a word and their images antecedent to speaking may also have something to do with the result. The same may be said of such dissimilations as Gr. *Σαπφώ* < *Ψαπφώ* or Lat. *obsetrix* < *obstetrix* (cf. Carnoy, *l.c.*), of many instances of haplology, *e.g.* Gr. *ἡμέδιμνον* < *ἡμι-μέδιμνον*, Lat. *medialem* < **medi-dialem*; for the consciousness of derivation will make the omission more difficult for the speaker than the hearer, since the latter will not think of the meaning of the word till after the perception of the same, and even then if he recognizes that he has heard wrongly there may be a predisposition to follow his wrong perception unconsciously when he himself uses the word. Similarly many instances of metathesis are more easily understood by assigning a part of the responsibility for the change to the hearer, *e.g.* Lat. *leriquiae* for *reliquiae*, *displicina* for *disciplina*, particularly when, as in the latter example, association with another word (*displiceo*) facilitated the change. In fact, such secondary associations for a word are highly improbable until it has been heard by persons to whom it is more or less unfamiliar. This consideration brings us to another point. A glance over the different examples of distant assimilation and dissimilation, haplology, and metathesis, given, *e.g.*, by Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I,² 847 ff., reveals a particularly high proportion of words which must have been unfamiliar at least to some persons or at some time (borrowed words, technical words, proper names, long words). Now except in the rare cases

⁴ It need hardly be said that these examples and most subsequent ones were selected merely for the purpose of illustrating processes that must have been of common occurrence, without in the least claiming that these very words were the ones which *must* have gone through these processes.

where a word is coined, the use of an unfamiliar word means the reproduction of one heard in some one else's speech, and the failure to reproduce it accurately usually involves having heard the word wrongly at the time, although subsequent distortion of the image of the unfamiliar word is also possible. Therefore false perception by the hearer must be held accountable for the later false reproduction in the larger part of these kinds of changes.

In the final stage of syncope and apocope the influence of the hearer again is probably very great. Just before the middle vowel of French *acheter*, for example, or the original final vowel of Lat. *animal* disappeared, it was pronounced so obscurely that the hearer could not recognize it at all times. He might then reproduce these words without the vowels being pronounced at all.

If the influence of wrong interpretation of the speaker by the hearer thus shows itself even in phonetic changes, it is much more potent in word formation, in changes of meaning, and in syntactical changes. These are often so subtle that the difference between the usage of the first speaker and of the original hearer, who changed the usage, is either not detected at all, or only a vague feeling of difference is caused, altogether insufficient to center the attention upon itself and thus lead to correction.

In the formation of words all those innovations which are due to wrong division of words in a sentence or wrong analysis of individual words, are to be ascribed largely to the influence of the hearer. Uncertainty of analysis can be found only with those who are not complete masters of the word or expression they are using, and who therefore have previously acted in the capacity of hearer rather than speaker. Thus no one who fully understood and used correctly Fr. *amie* 'friend' would while speaking have analyzed *m'amie* 'my friend' as *ma mie* (cf. *ma mère*), and then used *mie* regularly as 'friend'; but in the transmission from the speaker to the hearer who is less familiar with the word or combination,

such a false analysis would be easier to understand. It might be argued that the example given must have been a familiar one to nearly every one who understood the language, but even if so, wrong analysis is much easier for the hearer, who can be caught off his guard as it were, than it would be for the speaker. An exactly similar case is the abstraction of Greek *ἄττα* from combinations like *σμικρά ττα*,⁵ analyzed *σμίκρ'* *ἄττα*, an unthinkable mistake for a speaker who knew what he was saying.

When new suffixes arise by misdividing a word so that a part of the original stem is felt as being a part of the suffix, it is evident that such a misunderstanding again must usually arise in the hearer, since any one who has once analyzed a word correctly will not often capriciously desert his correct habit and create a new suffix during the very process of speaking. In *Greek Diminutives in -ιον*, 206, I have mentioned cases like *όψαρίδιον* 'little fish' (as an article of food) from a primitive *όψάριον*, which was itself originally a diminutive of *όψον*, but later became equivalent to it. At one time therefore some of the speakers of the language must have felt *όψάριον* as 'little fish,' others merely as 'fish.' If *όψαρίδιον* was first formed by those who considered *όψάριον* as merely 'fish,' it must have been analyzed as *όψαρ-ιδιον* or *όψαρί-διον*, but they might have been speaking to hearers to whom *όψάριον* meant 'little fish.' The result would be that the latter would analyze as *όψ-αρίδιον*, abstracting the new diminutive suffix *-αρίδιον*, for to them every part of the word except the simple stem *όψ-* would convey the diminutive idea. Similarly a new suffix is abstracted by referring a derivative to a parallel stem instead of the real primitive, as in Gr. *ψυκτηρ-ίδιον* 'little winecooler' (: *ψυκτήρ*), *κυμβ-ίδιον*, 'little cup' (: *κύμβος*, *κύμβη*), which have a suffix ab-

⁵ Wrong analysis was often fostered by habits of dividing syllables, necessarily so, for example, in the second case cited, where the division could only be *σμι-κράτ-τα*, for *ττ* (i.e., *t* as *geminata*) could not begin a syllable. The consequent necessary pronunciation of the first part of the *τ* in close connection with the preceding *α* blurred the place of the word division for the hearer.

stracted from words like *χυτρίδιον* 'little pot,' formed from *χυτρίς*, *χυτρίδος*, but referred to *χύτρα* and then analyzed *χυτρ-ίδιον*. This of course could not have been done by the first speaker who coined the word, but most probably took place in the transmission to some hearer, who as a matter of course could not know whether *χυτρίδιον* had been formed from *χυτρίς* or the equivalent *χύτρα*. Other examples might be cited *ad libitum*, without however introducing any new principles.

This same kind of mistake on the part of the hearer as to derivation is the cause of new formations in verbal stems as well as nominal stems, in case endings and personal endings as well as stem suffixes. Thus the regular classical Skr. denominative verbs in *-īya-* from nouns with short *i*, e.g. *arātīyāti* 'plots injury': *ārāti-h*, go back to the pattern *janīyāti* 'seeks a wife,' which, though derived from *jāni*, was referred to *jāni-* by the hearer. The *ē/ō* subjunctives formed from athematic tense stems, which originally could form the subjunctive only with the short thematic vowel, e.g. Skr. *ayā-h* *ayā-t*, Gr. *ἴωμεν* instead of *āya-h* *āya-t*, *ἴομεν*, are to be explained similarly. The patterns were cases like Skr. *bhárā-t*, Gr. *φέρη-τε*, which are regularly derived from the thematic forms like *bhára-ti* and *φέρε-τε*, but could be referred by the hearer to the equivalent athematic *bhár-ti* and *φέρτε*.

As an example of a case-ending for the development of which the hearer is largely responsible might be mentioned the I. E. nom. acc. pl. neut. ending *-ā* for *o* stems, found, e.g., in Skr. *yugā*, Gr. *ζυγά*, Lat. *juga*. The reinterpretation of this ending from a collective feminine nominative singular, like Ger. *Gejöche*, to a real neuter plural forming a part of the same case system as, e.g., Gr. *ζυγόν*, *ζυγῷ*, or *ζυγῶν*, could take place only in the transmission from the speaker to the hearer; for he to whom any particular form in *-ā* ever was feminine singular could not easily change his point of view. Among personal endings of the verb Gr. *-σαν* as secondary ending of the third person plural, e.g. in

the athematic imperfects like *ἔδιδοσαν* or *ἔδεικνυσαν*, aorists like *ἔδο-σαν*, and pluperfects like *ἔλελύκε-σαν*, has a similar origin. It arose from forms like *ἔδειξαν*, *i.e.*, *ἔδεικ-σα-ν*, in which the complex of suffix *-σα-* plus personal ending *-ν* was mistaken as personal ending, by the hearer of course. That this was a difficult misunderstanding even so, and had to be facilitated by the association of *ἔδειξαν* with the original **ἔδεικ-μεν* from **ἔδεικ-σ-μεν* and **ἔδεικ-τε* from **ἔδεικ-σ-τε*, that, moreover, in *ἔδειξαν* itself the original stem suffix was *-σ-*, and that the personal ending *-αν* also has behind it a further history, does not affect the principle involved here. Cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II, 3,² 631 for the history of the form.

A very extensive category in which the hearer's interpretation of the speaker is one of the principal, if not the principal, cause of its existence consists of those adverbs which arose from stereotyped case forms. Of any individual's attitude toward such a form we may say that if he ever distinctly felt it as a case form he always will do so. To take only a few instances of an almost illimitable category, he to whom Gr. *μέγα*, *e.g.* in *μέγα βοῶν* 'shout loudly,' was still a cognate accusative, to whom Skr. *cirā-m* 'long' was still an accusative of extent of time, he who ever felt Lat. *domi* 'at home' as a locative case of *domus*, or O. H. G. *nahtes* (Ger. *nachts*) 'during the night' as a genitive of time within which, would almost always continue to feel these forms as living cases; but on the other hand the hearer, who would perceive only the speaker's meaning of the whole without being able to follow his attitude in detail, could easily fail to feel the connection of such uses with the regular paradigm, and in that case the forms would to him be adverbs, the mechanical repetition of which without analysis would soon establish them as independent words — the case forms have become stereotyped.

Just as this group of adverbs in their development from case forms, so again prepositions which were felt as governing cases, in their development from adverbs, largely

depended on the transmission to the hearer. If an individual once definitely felt, *e.g.* in the sentence $\epsilon\kappa\ \delta\epsilon\ \nu\eta\circ\ \beta\hat{\eta}$ (A 439, 'she stepped from the ship'), the case as dependent on the verb and consequently by itself meaning 'from the ship,' while the $\epsilon\kappa$ was to him simply an adverb 'outside' and connected only with the verb, with no closer relation to the substantive, it is hard to see how he could ever come to the point where he forgot the case meaning and connected the preposition so closely with the substantive as to feel a relation of dependence of the latter on the former. On the other hand, failure to follow the freer uses of such combinations on the part of others is very natural and would probably result ultimately in assuming the relation of government which is the principal earmark of the preposition in its connection with substantives. The same could of course be illustrated by any other prepositional phrase in which the 'governed' case shows traces of meanings belonging to the case as such, *e.g.* in Latin *in aedibus esse*, which developed from 'to be inside *in* the building' (*aedibus*), to 'to be in the building.'

A more isolated instance of a similar change which must be attributed to the interpretation of the hearer is the reinterpretation of the old Greek particle $\tau\hat{\eta}$ 'there' (cf. the pronominal stem $\tau\circ-$) as an imperative meaning 'take.' Thus 1347, *Κύκλωψ, τ\hat{\eta}, π\acute{e} οίνον*, 'there, Cyclops, drink wine,' could easily be felt by a hearer as 'take, Cyclops, drink wine.' That such reinterpretation took place somewhere is shown by Sophron's plural $\tau\hat{\eta}\tau\epsilon$, with regular verbal ending. Cf. Brugmann-Thumb, *Griech. Gram.* 616, where attention is called to the fact that a pattern for such a formation existed in $\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, plural of the verb form $\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon$, which, conversely, had become a mere particle.

The same process was involved when prior nominal members of compounds were reinterpreted as verbal. The reinterpretation of Gr. *φιλόξενος* 'having a dear guest friend' as 'loving one's guest friend' and consequent association with

the verb *φιλέω*, of O. H. G. *strīt-muot* 'cupidity for the fight (*strīt*)' as 'cupidity to fight (*strītan*),' of O. H. G. *danc-bāri* 'gratias referens' as being derived from *dankōn* 'to thank,' could well take place only in the hearer. And only a person who had thus changed the interpretation of words heard by himself would be apt to form such compounds as Ger. *anwendbar*, of which the first member is an indisputable verb.

In the changes so far discussed the semantic aspect was often of great importance, but even when the reinterpretation of the hearer was one of meaning, it led to changes of form when the hearer later became speaker. We may now consider the influence of the hearer on semantic change independent of any formal changes, although there are no hard and fast dividing lines. Compare, for example, the change of attitude toward the Greek aorists in *-ην*, like *ἐφάνην*, originally intransitive ('I appeared'), but evidently interpreted by the hearer as a passive ('I was shown') in connection with the active verb *φαίνω* 'I show.' Primarily a purely semantic change, it influenced without question the development of first aorist passives like *ἐλύθην*, and consequently had its secondary influence on form also.

Of the various categories of semantic change mentioned by Wundt in the eighth chapter of his *Sprachpsychologie*, those changes which result in making an originally subordinate element in the meaning of a word the dominant one, show the influence of the hearer to a pronounced degree. Thus while the shift of meaning of Lat. *penna* 'feather' to that of Eng. *pen* could go on independently of the hearer as long as it designated only a quill used for writing, yet the change of attitude which made it possible to use the word of a steel pen in modern times was most probably a shift of attention on the part of the hearer compared with that of the speaker. The latter considered the dominant element of the meaning that expressed by Eng. *feather*, the object which the word always designated being in this instance merely put to a different use. In the transmission to the hearer, however, its

use for writing could appear as the dominant element whenever it was thus applied, and after this interpretation became habitual it was natural to use the word also of a steel pen. In this case, too, it might be mentioned that a person meeting the word for the first time in such an application would necessarily feel as the dominant element that which was suggested by the situation, namely, that of being used for writing; and that, therefore, the younger generation plays a large part in such shifts of meaning. The influence of the hearer on a change of the dominating element of the meaning of a word can also be illustrated by Gr. *oī ἔροι*. Originally meaning 'the strangers,' it could be applied to hired soldiers who came from other states in contrast to citizen soldiers without affecting the dominant element. The fact, however, that these soldiers from other states were mercenaries could lead the hearer to consider 'mercenary' the essential part of the meaning, and thus the way could be paved for applying the term *oī ἔροι* even to such mercenaries as were not strangers, if such a thing were possible under the Greek system. On the other hand *ἔρος* 'stranger' could also be applied to the visiting stranger or guest friend, and the hearer might feel this to be the important element in the complex rather than the foreign origin felt by the speaker, and thus became fixed the meaning 'guest friend.' In almost the same way I. E. **ghosti-s* 'stranger' became Lat. *hostis* 'enemy,' but Ger. *gast* and Eng. *guest*.

In no category is there a greater probability of the hearer's attitude differing from the speaker's than in all changes which involve the affective elements. Pleasure or displeasure of the speaker will indeed make themselves known to the hearer when they are intense enough to reveal themselves in his expressive movements (facial or otherwise), but even then the hearer will often not be able to judge to what elemental parts of the discourse of the speaker the feeling belongs, and at other times it may escape him altogether. There is consequently the possibility of associating the expressed feeling

with the wrong word, of not perceiving it at all, and of substituting his own attitude for that of the speaker. The latter occurs, for example, in cases like Gr. *εὐηθύς*, originally 'of good character, good-hearted.' Hearers who despised this quality associated their own feeling of contempt with the word, and therefore perceived it and subsequently used it as meaning 'foolish.' A similar change is found in Gr. *ἰδιώτης*, which was at first only an objective designation of a private citizen or soldier or man without expert knowledge. When heard, however, and later used, by those who felt themselves superior to individuals so designated, e.g. the officer in regard to the private, or the man of knowledge in regard to the uninitiated, the result was the association with the word of that contempt which later appeared in the meaning of the English derivative *idiot*. In a case like this, of course, it cannot be claimed that the association of the word with the feeling must have taken place at the very time the hearer heard the word, but may well have occurred subsequently in the interval between hearing and using it. In this case it would not properly illustrate the process here discussed. On the other hand the influence of the hearer is much more probable again in case of Ger. *elend* O. H. G. *eli-lenti*. The development from 'exiled' or 'homeless' to 'miserable' took place most easily through the hearer's considering the feeling resulting from homelessness as the essential element when the word was used by the speaker in a more objective sense, although not necessarily without secondary associated feeling.

The hearer's failure to understand fully or at all the feeling-tone of expressions used by the speaker is the cause of a large part of the weakening or fading out of emotional words or expressions. When, for example, one spoke of a *terribly* hideous dream, it might well be with the idea that the dream was so hideous as actually to inspire terror, but the chances are that the hearer would not be able to follow and that it would to him be synonymous with a *very* hideous dream. As

a result he might speak of a *terribly* good time, just as in popular language *awfully* is so often used. In Ger. *sehr* the meaning 'very' has actually supplanted 'painfully' altogether, and in Gr. *αἰνῶς* 'very' existed alongside of 'terribly' as a perfectly reputable meaning. The same process accounts for the fading of emotional elements in diminutives. If *Johnny* was originally always used as a term of endearment, the hearer would often not notice it, and it would to him become a mere name. Similarly Gr. *παιδίον* 'little boy or girl' lost its hypocoristic meaning largely because of the hearer's inability to understand the speaker's affection; and in the same way Ger. *Mädchen* 'dear little girl' became simply 'girl.'

The hearer again played an important part in those semantic changes which were called by Wundt *associative Verdichtung*, *i.e.*, associative condensation, which takes place when a word becomes associated with another which originally stood in no relation to it, and as a result absorbs the meaning of the latter and correspondingly changes its own meaning. The first group of such changes is due to associations of a syntactic nature, as when the meaning of the phrase *capital city* became condensed into the single word *capital*, which then became a noun instead of an adjective. The first step in such a change, the coalescing of the meaning of the two words, took place most easily in the transmission to the hearer. The second step, the use of one word to represent the two, was a conscious ellipsis at first, and did not differ from abbreviations like *Fred* for *Frederick* and *car* for *motor car*, in which the missing syllables or words were at first supplied from the memory of the hearer. The ellipsis itself, however, concerns the speaker exclusively. In the third step again, in the fading of the suppressed part from the memory, the hearer plays a prominent part once more. That the person who considered *capital* an adjective suggesting the modified noun and used it thus would not so easily change his attitude as the hearer, is self-evident. The latter

would naturally attribute the whole of the meaning of *capital city* to *capital* itself if he had not been in the habit of using the same ellipsis, and if the context, as usually, nevertheless made clear the speaker's meaning. All three steps can also be illustrated by French *pas* for *ne . . . pas*. Surely any one who ever felt this as 'not a step,' 'not a bit' would continue to do so, but the child learning the language, for example, would be prone to see nothing in the group but an emphatic *not*, of which *pas* was the really important part. Only after that could *ne* be omitted and *pas* appear as a complete negative in phrases like *pas encore* 'not yet.' Similar condensations are, e.g., *university* from the original *universitas scholiarium* or *litterarum*, and *glass* for *glass tumbler*.

In the second class of condensations, in which the word takes upon itself semantic factors from particular uses or applications, the hearer again is not to be neglected. As an example may serve Gr. *στρουθός*, originally 'bird' of any kind (as is shown by the phrase *μόνος ἔγαστρος στρουθός* 'the large bird,' i.e. 'ostrich'), but usually 'sparrow.' This, the commonest bird, was oftenest so designated, and the speaker was not introducing an innovation when he applied the general term to this particular kind of bird. However, the hearer, understanding the word to refer to the sparrow, would easily associate with it everything possible under the circumstances, and could not, except in case of habitual identity of his own usage, know whether the speaker had associated with that word the general notion of any bird or only the kind of bird present. Similarly the association of Eng. *wheel* with a bicycle was facilitated by the hearer's tendency to inject into the word everything that would be in harmony with the situation rather than to take it in the more general way.

Just as the modifying perception of the hearer is a factor in the fading out of the affective elements of a word, so it may also be in the fading of metaphors, taking the latter term in the real psychological sense of a conscious individual transfer of a word to something perceived as similar.

If the speaker, for example, uses the word *fox* of a cunning person, or *goose* of a silly woman, with full consciousness of the animals compared, the hearer may associate the meaning of cunning or silliness directly with the word or without thinking of the animals, particularly if he first becomes acquainted with such words in their metaphorical use. Consequently no doubt the learning of a language by the children may be of considerable influence in the incorporation and fading of metaphors. However, in cases like these mentioned, they will be bound to meet the original use also, and this may cause them secondarily to feel the transferred use as metaphorical after all. On the whole, individuals will themselves vary in their attitude toward such words, feeling them as metaphors only if their discourse is sufficiently slow to arouse the images of the animals compared. Where, however, as in case of Eng. *vixen*, the original meaning has all but disappeared, association with the animal must be very rare. The same is true, e.g., for Ger. *Kran* 'crane' in the metaphorical sense of a machine for loading ships as opposed to *Kranich* designating the animal. That these two originally synonymous words should have been thus differentiated presupposes the fading of the metaphor, and cannot be the cause of it, since as long as it was understood to be a metaphor, formal identity of the words for both ideas was a necessity. On the whole we may say that the greater the difference between the thing originally designated and the thing to which the word is applied metaphorically, the greater the chances of the hearer not noticing the figurative use and considering a word thus used as a different word. It is very doubtful if there are any who think of Eng. *crane*, when used of the machine, as being the same word as that designating the bird, unless they are reflecting etymologists. Neither would a Roman, after *pupilla* 'little girl' had been used of the pupil of the eye because of the reflected image in it, have associated this application very often with the original use; in fact the hearer would never have understood the reason

for the name unless it had been explained to him. In such metaphors, then, the interpretation of the words by the hearer as plain language was a foregone conclusion. Also in case of derivatives from such metaphors, like Eng. *cocky* or Fr. *caprice*, Ital. *cappuccio*, originally 'goat-like behavior' (Lat. *capra* 'goat'), the hearer would be particularly prone not to understand the use as figurative.

The last larger group of semantic changes in which the hearer plays a prominent part is the wiping out of small distinctions between partial synonyms. To him it will very often be impossible to follow the speaker in drawing slight distinctions between words of similar meaning, for his only criteria are his own past experience with the word and the present situation in which it is placed. Consequently distinctions which have gained a foothold on only a part of the linguistic community are continually leveled again, while others even fail in the first place to establish themselves in the approbation of a sufficient number of individuals to be sanctioned by usage. From the Greek Prodicus to the Crabbs of modern English, synonym mongers may well be driven to despair by the obtuseness and refractory attitude of the people as a whole in accepting their distinctions in the first place, and also by their utter inability to maintain such distinctions as they may have discovered (or imagined to have discovered) in actual usage. For even when these slight differences are based on actual usage, in as much as the associative habits of each word often result in tendencies which to him who analyses usage seem to warrant drawing these fine distinctions, even in these cases the leveling influence of the hearer will continually show itself. Thus Gr. *λαλεῖν* which, as shown by Ger. *lallen*,⁶ originally meant 'to chatter,' again and again occurs as a respectable word for *λέγειν* 'to speak' or 'talk,' e.g. in the New Testament, where the use is frequent. For how should the hearer know, in case the

⁶ This and similar examples in the articles of Buck, *A.J.P.* xxxvi, 1 ff., 125 ff.

speaker used the word of connected discourse with an air of contempt, whether that contempt was supposed to be associated with the choice of that particular word? He could substitute the purely objective *λέγειν* and still speak the whole sentence with the same contempt. So also the distinction between *βούλεσθαι* 'to wish' (in the sense of 'desire') and *ἐθέλειν* 'be willing,' and between *ἀγαπᾶν*, *φιλεῖν*, and *ἐρᾶν*, which express various modifications of 'to love,' are continually violated, though real. No wonder, then, that Prodicus failed utterly when he wanted to introduce a distinction between *ηδεσθαι* and *εὐφραίνεσθαι*, and claimed that the former should be confined to sensuous pleasure as opposed to the intellectual pleasure of the latter (Plato, *Prot.* 337 C). Nor is English any more successful in maintaining its distinctions. The common man pays absolutely no attention to any difference between *sweat* and *perspiration*, *cyclone* and *tornado*, *fiddle* and *violin*, no matter whether such differences originated in associative habits of a part of the linguistic community or whether they are conscious attempts to establish distinctions for some purpose or other.

Sometimes the hearer may at least assist in the fading of distinctions between whole groups of words. The clearest case is the tendency to wipe out the difference between primitives and diminutives which designate, not a particularly small individual of a class, but a small class. Cf. *Greek Diminutives in -ιον*, 166. If, for example, a speaker used *παιδίον* 'little child' of one twelve years old and of normal size, it was because small size is characteristic of the class 'children' as opposed to 'adults.' In very many instances such associations could not be reproduced in the hearer, who saw only the application to an individual by no means below the average of those which the primitive could designate. To him therefore *παιδίον* appeared equivalent to *παῖς* 'child' when thus used, and he might consequently himself use it without any reference to small size whatsoever. Compare in English the stereotyped use of *young girl*, designating in reality just

those individuals who are above the average of the size of girls (which of course includes children).

Particularly good examples of the influence of the hearer in leveling slight distinctions are found in syntactical changes, which are merely one kind of semantic change offering particularly good chances for the speaker's not following the hearer because of the delicacy and subtlety of the association of words in the sentence. In syntactical changes more than in any others the hearer may perceive the relation of linguistic elements or the meaning of a particular element differently from the speaker, without changing the essential meaning of the whole and without being detected and suffering correction. Thus leveling of small distinctions is the first step of syncretism, so that the hearer plays a very important part in this common syntactic phenomenon also.

In case-syncretism this step may be illustrated by a comparison of the constructions used in Sanskrit and Latin to express the material out of which something is made. Originally, as is shown by the fact that Sanskrit allows both the instrumental and ablative, this could be expressed in two distinct ways at least. Thus Skr. *kar-* with the ablative was 'to make from,' but with the instrumental 'to make with' (e.g. *carmanā krtah* 'made with leather,' cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II, 2,² 486). Although these two expressions referred to the same situation, the speaker must have had a distinctly different attitude in each case. Only when the hearer is taken into consideration are misunderstanding and confusion intelligible, for he would hardly do any more than perceive the whole phrase as referring to the whole situation, and to him the two constructions might become identical. Here, then, there is a starting point for the confusion of the two cases which was the first step of the complete syncretism found in the Italic languages. There is no telling whether the speakers felt the Latin *ligno fabricatus* as 'made from wood' or 'made with wood,' or whether, as is most probable, the phrase was interpreted in its entirety without distinct

feeling for the use of the case. In fact, without such mechanization in the beginning there could be no syncretism.

In the history of the tenses the development of the perfect is a good example of the same process. How did this tense, originally designating the state resulting from a past completed action, become an aorist, which refers to the action itself, *e.g.* in later Greek and in Latin? To begin with, a speaker would have distinguished very sharply between *τέθνηκε* 'he is dead' and *ἔθαυε* 'he died,' but many a situation in which the difference was of no importance would cause uncertainty and consequent confusion between the meanings of the two forms for the hearer, who would then perhaps use them without distinction, as *εἶδον καὶ ἤξιώκα* (160 B.C.) in a papyrus quoted by Brugmann, *op. cit.* II, 3,² 775. On the other hand, in the Germanic preterite-presents the disappearance of the association with the past action preceding the resultative state was also at least facilitated by the attitude of the hearer. I. E. **uida*, Skr. *vēda*, Gr. *οἶδα*, originally 'I have seen or found out and therefore know,' became Goth. *wait*, O. H. G. *weiz* 'I know' largely because the hearer could not follow the speaker when he still thought of the past acquisition of the knowledge in situations in which this aspect was unimportant and therefore not brought out by the context.

In the syncretism of the optative and subjunctive, as completed, for example, in the Italic and Germanic languages, instances like the following were important as bringing about the beginning of the feeling of equivalence. The attitude of the speaker toward the jussive subjunctive was thoroughly different from that toward the prescriptive optative. To him, *e.g.*, Skr. *athō ēta varam avṛṇita: mayāiva prācī diṣṭa pra jānāthēti* (A.B. I, 7, 4) meant 'therewith he made this condition: through me you *shall* find the eastern region,' while *tātra yāt pācyēs tān ma ā caksīthāh* (C.B. XI, 6, 1, 2) meant 'whatever you may see there (*i.e.* in the East) you *might* report to me,' or 'I *wish* you would report to me.' To the

hearer, however, there was nothing in the context which would make the subjunctive in the first passage different from the optative in the second, with the result that he might feel the two moods as used in exactly the same way. Similarly in Greek *φέρ' ὁ τέκνον, νῦν καὶ τὸ τῆς νήσου μάθης* (Soph. *Ph.* 300) 'come now, child, you shall learn about the island,' with its jussive or voluntative subjunctive, might not appear to the hearer as different from *χωροῖς ἀν εἰσω* (Soph. *Ph.* 674), 'you might go inside,' with a prescriptive optative derived from the potential.

The hearer's influence in syntactic changes is not confined to the leveling of small distinctions, but at other times he may substitute his own interpretation for that of the speaker. It is, in fact, hard to see how certain changes which are not gradual, but presuppose a sudden leap, can be explained from the point of view of the speaker alone. There is, for example, no middle ground between the original interpretation of Skr. *nāma*, Gr. *ὄνομα* as nominative, and the later conception of the same as accusative of specification in sentences like *διὰ μέσου δὲ ῥεῖ τούτων ποταμὸς Κάρσος ὄνομα, εὖρος πλέθρου* (Xen. *An.* I, 4, 4); and the same may be said of *εὖρος* in the same sentence. If a person once considered such a sentence as consisting of three paratactic clauses ('between these flows a river, Carsus is its name, the width is of a plethrum'), there is very slight probability that some subtle association with 'accusatives of specification' of different origin would cause reinterpretation as an accusative, for there is no way by which this can be done gradually. It will be either nominative or accusative; there is no middle ground. On the other hand, the hearer, who has no direct indication of the speaker's attitude, may just as well perceive these words as accusatives if there are at hand as patterns other accusatives of specification, of different origin, as in *ἀποτμηθέντες τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐτελεύτησαν* (*ib.* II, 6, 1). Instead of the three paratactic clauses there will then appear only one to the hearer: 'a river, Carsus by name, of a plethrum in width.'

A similar instance is the reinterpretation of the old dative 'of interest' as dative of the agent, with gerundives and other verbal adjectives of similar meaning. There is however this difference, that only a different interpretation of the case is involved, but not a different case. Thus Gr. *ποιητέον ἐμοί*, Lat. *faciendum mihi*, were originally 'for me it is something to be done,' and would almost necessarily remain so for a speaker who ever used them with this attitude. The change to 'this must be done by me' evidently took place in the transmission to the hearer. Only after such a change of attitude⁷ would it be possible to extend the use of the dative of the agent first to ordinary passive participles,⁸ e.g. *neque haec visast mihi* (Plaut.) 'nor was she seen by me,' then to finite verbs of the perfect system, e.g. *πάνθ' ἡμῖν πεποίηται* (Xen.) 'everything has been done by us,' and even to finite verbs which do not belong to the perfect system, e.g. *τοῖς δὲ Κερκυραῖοις οὐχ ἐωρῶντο* (Thuc.) 'they were not seen by the Cercyraei.'

In the construction of the accusative with the infinitive the part of the hearer is again shown by the fact that there is no transition stage between the original attitude represented by Eng. *I know this to be true*, where *this* is felt as depending on the verb *know* while the infinitive is a second object, and the attitude toward many similar constructions of the classical languages, in which the accusative is felt as subject of the infinitive. In a sentence like Lat. *jube hunc abire aliquo* (Ter. *Heaut.* 585) the speaker at one stage would have felt the accusative as depending on the verb, but the hearer would probably not follow him, with the result that the accusative appeared as subject of the infinitive and the connection with the verb was broken completely. Only after this stage was reached could the hearer himself use such ac-

⁷ Association of one verb form with another and consequent imitation of the construction of the one must also have played its part in such changes, which would then involve the speaker only.

⁸ With these the original attitude is often still possible, though the translation as a dative of 'interest' may seem strained.

cusatives in connection with verbs which could not themselves be used with an accusative, e.g., *ego quidem tibi non sim auctor te quoque profugere*, (Cic. *Att.* IX, 10, 5), or with impersonals, e.g., *sed tum nimis inter omnis constabat neminem esse resalutatum* (Cic. *Phil.* II, 41, 106).

The case of constructions like the Greek genitive absolute and the Latin ablative absolute is parallel to that of the accusative with the infinitive. However much the ground may have been prepared beforehand by using these cases in connections which show their meaning to be more and more strained, yet the final step of feeling them as not depending on the principal verb at all, but as being a sort of dependent clause with the participle as predicate, is a sudden leap which is best explained as due to the failure of the hearer any longer to understand the strained case meaning of the noun as intended by the speaker. Thus in the Skr. *īndra prātār havāmaha, īndra prayaty ādhvarē* (R.V. I, 16, 3) the speaker could have conceived the locative of the noun with the participle as a locative of time ('upon Indra we call early, upon Indra at the time of the advancing sacrifice') but the hearer, since this is straining the locative of time somewhat, might not follow and might interpret by analogy with synonymous temporal clause, as 'the sacrifice advancing,' thus affording a pattern for sentences like *kritē sóme maitrāvaruṇāya dandā prā yachati* (T.S. 6, 1, 4, 2) 'the *soma* being bought, he hands to M. the staff,' in which the locative could not possibly be connected with the main verb directly. The same process in case of the Greek genitive absolute, as far as that was ablative in origin, might be illustrated by Xen. *An.* I, 1, 8, *ώστε οὐδὲν ἤχθετο αὐτῶν πολεμούντων*: The speaker might feel it as a genitive of cause: 'so that he was vexed in no way because of them fighting.' If so, he would hardly change to the absolute interpretation, but a hearer might fail to see the connection and feel the genitives to mean 'they fighting.' After that it would be easy to use the same construction even when the genitive could not depend on the main

verb, as in *An.* I, 4, 10, *καὶ μεταπεμπομένου αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔθέλω ἔλθεῖν*, 'even though he keeps on sending for me, I am not willing to go,' where the absolute construction takes the place of a concessive clause. Exactly the same process was at work, of course, in the same construction as far as derived from the true genitive, in the Latin ablative absolute, the Slavic and Germanic dative absolute, etc.

Further examples of syntactical changes in which the transmission from the speaker to the hearer played a part might be multiplied almost indefinitely. Two more will suffice.

The use of infinitives in commands, *e.g.* in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, is merely a case of condensation as explained above. As is shown by Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II, 3,² 939 ff., this arose through ellipsis of some verb, *e.g.* a verb of commanding, which took the infinitive as object. While there is no trace of such a verb in a sentence like E 124, *θαρσῶν νῦν, Διόμηδες, ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι*, 'fight now, D., courageously against the Trojans,' the whole process is clearly shown by Varro, *R. R.* I, 31, 1, *tertio intervallo inter vergiliarum exortum et solstitium haec fieri debent. vineas novellas fodere aut arare, et postea occare*, etc. Though all of these may have been intended by the writer to depend on *debent*, yet the reader (hearer) would be prone to feel them independently as the direct expression of a command, and the farther these infinitives were removed from the verb on which they depended, the more likely would be this interpretation.

In the development of the passive meaning from the middle the influence of the hearer is well illustrated by Lat. *lustrari*, *e.g.*, *lustramurque Jovi votisque incendimus aras* (Verg. *Aen.* III, 279). Are those who take part in the rite purified by the god or do they purify themselves through the rite? That in many cases like this one the hearer may substitute his own attitude for that of the speaker requires no demonstration.

We may summarize by saying that the influence of the hearer upon linguistic change shows itself mainly in two ways. He may misperceive directly what the speaker has said, as in

those phonetic changes for which he is responsible; but more important is the difficulty of reintegrating the elemental units of the language in exactly the same way as the speaker conceived the whole before he analyzed it in the formation of his sentence. Here there is only approximation at best. Where the difference is inessential or not detected, we cannot speak of linguistic changes; but where the hearer uses an expression according to his own reintegration of the speaker's discourse rather than the way it was meant by the speaker, there is a very important source of changes. The more complex and elusive the relation of elements to each other, the greater the probability of the hearer's deviating from the speaker.

III. — *Richard Bentley's Critical Notes on Arrian's Discourses of Epictetus*

By PROFESSOR WILLIAM ABBOTT OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

A FEW years ago while working upon a bibliography of Epictetus I had my attention called to the fact that the British Museum possesses a copy of Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus* which once belonged to Richard Bentley and contains in the margins numerous critical annotations upon the text in that scholar's handwriting.¹ That even the informal *marginalia* of so great a critic are generally felt to have a value for classical philology, one may reasonably infer from the large number of separate publications of the same. Accordingly, through the kindness of officials of the British Museum, Mr. Reginald Geare very courteously copied for me all the passages in question, together with Bentley's notes, and the corresponding text in H. Schenkl's *editio maior* of Arrian (Teubner, 1894), in so far as he was able to identify them, for in the edition which Bentley used,² one based on

¹ Upon the history of the acquisition of a number of Bentley's books by the British Museum see the article in the *Literary Panorama* for October, 1807 (reprinted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, November, 1807, p. 1047), and A. T. Bartholomew and J. W. Clark, *Richard Bentley, D.D., a Bibliography, etc.*, Cambridge, 1908, p. x. Compare also the British Museum *Catalogue of Printed Books*, under *Richard Bentley*, "Books containing MS. Notes by Bentley," where, by a curious oversight, Schegk's *Arrian* is not listed, but only the work which is bound in one volume with it and stands first, *i.e.*, the Wechel edition of Nicomachus Gerasinus. The correct entry appears under *Epictetus*.

² This was the edition which appeared at Basel in 1554, prepared by the Tübingen physician, Heinrich Schegk (the name appears as 'Scheggio' on the general title page, 'Schegk' in the editor's address to his readers, p. 362, and 'Schekio' in the superscription to the translation), as Professor C. H. Moore was so good as to determine for me by a comparison of a number of readings in Mr. Geare's copy with the copy of Schegk's work in the Harvard Library. Schegk reprinted the very faulty text of Trincavelli, contenting himself for the most part with making numerous corrections of it in the Latin translation which he added.

that of Trincavelli (Venice, 1535) there was a most confusing displacement in the text (see Schweighäuser on III, 26, 33), which made verification with Schenkl's edition at some places rather difficult.

It does not appear from the notes themselves just when Bentley occupied himself with Epictetus, nor do I find any indication about the matter in the biographies, but it seems not unlikely that it may have been during the seven years of arduous study (1683-1689) when he was a tutor in Dean Stillingfleet's family, a period when he was compiling his notorious 'indices,' and entering copious notes in the margins of his own books (see J. H. Monk, *Life of Richard Bentley*, I, 14 ff., and R. C. Jebb, *Richard Bentley*, 7); for Bentley did not in his later years evidence any marked interest in Epictetus, and, indeed, the only reference to him which I now recall (*Epistles of Phalaris*, I, 95 Dyce) is the rather unhappily positive remark, that Mr. Boyle "knew not, it seems, that common story that Epictetus was lame of one leg, not by chains and imprisonment, but merely by rheumatism," for the "common story" is the one which Boyle gives, and the other has but a single authority, and that a late one, in its support.³

In the following report and discussion I shall use the symbols employed by H. Schenkl, *Epicteti Dissertationes . . . iterum recensuit H. Schenkl, Leipzig, 1916*:

³ Bentley clearly prefers the matter-of-fact statement of Suidas to the more picturesque account of Celsus (Origen, *contra Cels.* VII, 53) which has left many echoes among the Greek Fathers (see the *testimonia* in Schenkl's *ed. maior* of Epictetus,² pp. VIII f.). The question is not quite so simple as it might appear. Ordinarily one would be inclined to accept the less sensational story, but it should be remembered that Celsus and others had made a great point of the bearing of Epictetus in the reputed breaking of his leg, and it is not impossible that a denial of the whole incident may have emanated from some overzealous Christian. Besides Celsus was probably a younger contemporary of Epictetus and ought to have been well informed. On the other hand, the very brief statement of Simplicius (*Commentary on the Encheiridion*, 102 b Heins.), $\chi\omega\lambda\delta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\kappa$ $\nu\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ $\eta\lambda\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma$, might seem to support the account of Suidas. Epictetus' own references to lameness are noncommittal, but of course he would have been the last person to boast about such a thing.

S = the Bodleian Ms., Misc. Gr. 251, the archetype of all existing MSS.

Sb, Sc, Sd = later correctors of S.

s = one or more copies of S.

The names, Schegk, Wolf, Upton, Schweighäuser, etc., refer to editions or critical notes by these scholars, for which see Schenkl, *op. cit.*, pp. cxI ff. I give all Bentley's critical readings; occasional expressions of approval or disapproval of sentiments in the text, or citations of the source from which quotations are taken, do not seem worth recording.

It might be well to note, finally, that Bentley almost certainly did not use a manuscript for his corrections. This follows partly because he makes no mention of any manuscript, and because if he had had one he would have corrected even more errors than he did, but especially because he does not notice the large displacement in the text before him at III, 26, 33 (where the passage IV, 1, 16-163 comes in out of place), which apparently is not found in the manuscripts, but only in the Trincavelli edition, and that of Schegk, which is reprinted from it.

The larger part of Bentley's corrections consists in restorations of readings which are now known to have been those of the archetype, S. From the point of view of text criticism, therefore, these have no importance, but I deem it only fair to Bentley's reputation to list them briefly together at this point, as ocular evidence of the sureness of his erudition and of his judgement in matters of criticism. I give the faulty reading first, followed by Bentley's emendation:

I, 1, 13 φάνεται]	φαίνεται	I, 1, 16 παρακόπτομεν (?)]
παρακύπτομεν	I, 5, 4 μέλλει]	μέλει
εύχρηστίαν	I, 6, 36 εύχάριστα]	εύχρηστα
συγκαθήκει]	I, 9, 34 δ' ἄλλον]	δι' ἄλλον (not a perfect emendation, but good as far as it goes)
ὑποδεδομένοι]	I, 17, 10 τακτικά]	στατικά
I, 18, 14 λύχνοις]	I, 24, 6 κακός]	κακόν
		I, 25, 8

δσον] ἀσον (ἀσον) I, 27, 6 προλείψεις] προλήψεις I, 28, 7
 ἐξαπάτηται] ἐξηπάτηται I, 28, 14 ἀπολείας] ἀπωλείας
 I, 28, 28 ἔλθομεν] ἔλθωμεν I, 28, 33 ποιεῖσθε] ποιεῖσθαι
 I, 29, 15 ὁ] οἱ I, 29, 22 μέλεις] μέλλεις II, 1, 39 θαρ-
 ροῦντος] θαρρούντως II, 9, 21 Ἰουδαῖος] Ἰουδαῖοι II, 14, 26
 εἰκεῖ] εἰκῆ (εἰκῆ) II, 15, 13 μετεπίσθη] μετεπείσθη II, 15, 15
 πιεῖν] ποιεῖν II, 16, 4 διαμέλεις] διαμένεις II, 17, 13 οἱ]
 εἰ II, 17, 22 μέλειν] μένειν II, 17, 22 ἀναγκάσοι] ἀναγ-
 κάσει II, 18, 22 πύκτας] παίκτας II, 19, 14 πεποίηται]
 πεποίησαι II, 19, 29 εὐροῦντας] εὐροοῦντας II, 20, 4
 ὀφελεθήση] ὠφελεθήση II, 20, 26 παιδίας] παιδείας II,
 21, 7 ἔρωτᾶ] ἔρωτα II, 21, 7 οἶόν τε] οἴονται II, 21, 15
 ἐκκαθαρθησόμενα] ἐκκαθαρθησόμενα II, 22, 10 ἐξέθρεψαι]
 ἐξέθρεψα III, 1, 36 νὴ τούς] μή, τούς III, 2, 18 εἶδος . . .
 ἀμφορέως] del. III, 7, 19 τὸ θεόν σοι. ἐπινοεῖς] τὸν θεόν
 σοι, ἐπινοεῖς III, 12, 5 ἐπιτευτικήν] ἐπιτευκτικήν III, 13,
 15 ἀχαίρων] Ἀχέρων III, 15, 4 ὅτι] ὅτε (In the same line
 Bentley underscored as corrupt ἐμβαλεῖν and ὀφρύν; the cor-
 rect readings are ἐκβαλεῖν and σφυρόν) III, 21, 1 ψυλά]
 ψυλά III, 21, 16 αὐτάς] αὐταί III, 21, 20 δ' ἀτρεῖον] δ'
 ἀτρεῖον III, 22, 37 μέλλει] μέλει III, 24, 6 ἡπτασθαι]
 ἡπτασθαι III, 24, 8 πόλιν] πάλιν III, 24, 18 οὐδ'] σὺ δ'
 III, 24, 21 θεομαχοῦντες] θεομαχοῦντος (exact reading of S
 uncertain) III, 24, 39 ἀναγκάστως] ἀναναγκάστως III,
 24, 39 χαμήσασθαι] χασμήσασθαι III, 24, 44 θήραις] θύραις
 (with S, but the reading is not certain, for Wolf and Schenkl
 print θύρας; Bentley underscored the letters *ais* as though he
 thought them corrupt) III, 24, 47 ἀποδεδωκός] ἀποδεδωκώς
 III, 24, 55 θήραις] θύραις (cf. III, 24, 44 above) III, 24, 61
 ὑποτιμούμενος] ὑποτιμώμενος III, 24, 62 ἀποροῦμεν] εὐπο-
 ροῦμεν III, 24, 64 κοινοῦ τοῦ] del. κοινοῦ III, 24, 66
 συνήθεις ἐγίνετο] συνήθης ἐγίνετο III, 24, 109 χύσεις] δια-
 χύσεις] III, 25, 8 οἰκία] οἰκεῖα III, 26, 25 ἀνωφελήσαυτον]
 ἀνωφελή σαυτόν III, 26, 33 ἔσχιστον] αἰσχιστον IV, 1,
 10 ἐκεῖνοι] εἰ ἐκεῖνοι IV, 1, 27 καλόν] κακον IV, 1, 53
 δυσύπατος] δισύπατος IV, 1, 59 τινές] τινός IV, 1, 67

οὐκ ἔδιον] οἰκίδιον IV, 1, 69 εἶναι] εἰ καὶ IV, 1, 82 κτίσεως]
 κτήσεως IV, 1, 88 ἀποτειχήζω] ἀποτειχίζω IV, 1, 92
 χειμόνες] χειμῶνες IV, 1, 104 θελησόμενον] θεασόμενον (S pr.
 θεασάμενον) IV, 1, 106 ἀνήκανος] ἀνίκανος IV, 1, 132
 ἀλλά] ἄλλα IV, 1, 173 καθάνθης] Κλεάνθης IV, 3, 12
 ἔξηγητά] ἔξηγητήν IV, 4, 46 ἀπ' αὐτῶν τά] ἀπαντῶντα IV,
 7, 31 ρίφιση] ρίφήση IV, 11, 31 λύεται] κυλίεται IV, 13,
 10 παρεκάλου] παρεκάλουν IV, 13, 22 ἀλλά] ἄλλα.

In the following passages Bentley's proposed reading is not that of S. His emendation is to be understood as correct, unless the opposite is stated. B., of course, means Bentley.

Introductory Epistle, 6 ἔχοι ἄν (ἔχοι αν S) ἔχοιεν B., with Sd. I, 8, 14 ἵδ' ἐγώ] εἰ δ' ἐγώ B., anticipated by Schegk, the Geneva ed. (1595) and Wolf.

I, 11, 27 ἄν] ἦν B., anticipated by Schegk and Wolf, and followed by J. B. Mayor.

I, 11, 27 ὡς] φ B., anticipated by Salmasius and the so-called 'Codex Uptoni,' a miscellaneous collection of emendations, partly from a Ms. at Mutina, and partly from conjectures and marginal readings in the early printed editions (see Schenkl, *op. cit.*, pp. LVIII ff.).

I, 14, 15 ποιεῖτε τῷ. τούτῳ θεῷ (τούτῳ τῷ θεῷ S, correctly)] B. deleted τῷ (*sic*), which, of course, is merely out of place, and should have been printed τῷ.

I, 23, 4 On μῦν B. refers to Diogenes Laertius for the statement that Mys was a servant of Epicurus, who took an active part in his philosophical studies.⁴ This is a point which

⁴ The passages in Diogenes Laertius bearing on Mys are: x, 3, ἀλλὰ καὶ Μῦς δνομα; x, 10, αὐτοὶ (*sc. οἱ οἰκέται*) συνεφιλοσόφουν αὐτῷ, ὃν ἦν ἐνδοξότατος δ προειρημένος Μῦς; and x, 21 (the will of Epicurus), ἀφίημι δὲ τῷ παιδῶν ἐλεύθερον Μῦν κτλ. Add also Gellius, II, 18, 8 . . . et Epicuri (*sc. servus*), cui Mys nomen fuit, philosophi non incelebris vixerunt (copied by Macrobius, I, 11, 42). Since Bentley's time our knowledge of Mys has been increased by five fragments from Philodemus (152-155 and 195 in Usener's *Epicurea*), which show that Mys was a prominent figure in the group about Epicurus. A letter directed to him by Epicurus was so famous as to be called ἡ λαμπρὰ ἐπιστολή (frag. 152).

seems to have escaped all the commentators, who offer the strained explanation that Epicurus had compared children with mice, for which view there seems to be no evidence (cf. frag. 19 in Usener's *Epicurea*, and its context). Bentley is probably correct in thinking that Epictetus is here referring to Mys, whom he playfully calls *μυιδίον* in the next line. In the next paragraph he speaks also quite naturally of a *παιδίον*, clearly referring to the "little mouse," and that without a word of explanation, which, if the interpretation offered by the commentators be correct, is very much called for. We ought, therefore, to print *Mῦν* here and understand that Mys was reared and perhaps born in the house of Epicurus.

I, 24, 7 *τὸ δὲ γυμνάσιον εἶναι* ("*ασιον* in litura, ut vid." in S, according to Schenkl)] "fortasse *γυμνητεύειν*" B. Schenkl, following s, has *γυμνὸν εἶναι*. Bentley's suggestion is excellent, furnishing the desired parallel to *καθεύδειν* in the next sentence.

I, 26, 7 *όργην* (*όργη*, *ν* erased, S)] *όργή* B.

I, 29, 16 *πραγμάτιον* (in the margin of S *τὸ σῶμα* is written by a later hand)]. Bentley underscored the word, as though he thought it corrupt, but hesitated to make a change, although it was easy enough. Schenkl adopts *σωμάτιον* from the Salamanca edition, but *πραγμάτιον* can be defended from III, 1, 31, where it is clearly a contemptuous expression for *σῶμα*, 'bodykin' as it were, a meaning quite in place here.

I, 29, 16 *συρῆ*] *συρθῆ* B. Veitch and Kühner-Blass give only *ἐσύρην* for the aorist passive, and I know of no evidence for *ἐσύρθην*. Possibly Bentley was thinking of *φύρω*.

I, 29, 21 *τοσοῦτον*] *τοσούτου* B., with s.

II, 1, 14 Haplography caused the omission in the text used by Bentley of two lines, from *τὸ θάρσος* through *τὸν θάνατον*. Bentley makes a tolerable sense by changing *φυγήν* to *φύσιν*, but the corruption was too extensive to be healed in that fashion.

II, 2, 16 *ἔχοι* (*ἔχει* S) *λόγον καὶ προσερεθίζει*] Bentley under-

scored *οι* in *ἔχοι*, as though he thought it corrupt, as it is, and read *προσερεθίζειν*. Wolf and Schweighäuser thought the passage corrupt, and Upton was uncertain, for, although he gives a different translation in his note, he still prints Wolf's version in his text. The common understanding of the sentence, 'Why is it then, that he renders no account to his judges, and adds a word of provocation?' (Matheson, after Upton), is unsatisfactory, because no answer is given to the question. Bentley's emendation, on the contrary, gives an excellent sense, and is probably correct. The passage would then run: 'Why is it unreasonable then to add also a word of provocation? Just as my friend Heraclitus,' etc.

II, 6, 22 *εἰναι ἐν 'Ρώμη] εἰναι ή ἐν 'Ρώμη* B., with s.

II, 6, 27 *ἐν τίσιν οὖν;] ἐν τίσι νῦν*; B. Schegk and Wolf also thought the words corrupt. Bentley's emendation is somewhat more pointed than the reading of S, and may be correct; but it is just as likely to be merely an improvement upon the original (his emendations, for that matter, may not infrequently be improvements).

II, 9, 6 *ἀφ' ὁν] ἐφ' ὁν* B., anticipated by Wolf. Schenkl adopted Wolf's emendation in his first edition, but returned to the Ms. tradition in his second. To me the change seems necessary.

II, 9, 11 *τὸν ἀναιδῆ] τὰ ἀναιδῆ* B., anticipated by Wolf.

II, 13, 17 *οὐδὲ στενάζει] οὐδεὶς στενάζει* B., a somewhat better reading, but again perhaps only an improvement upon the original.

II, 14, 23 *παραθησόμενα] πραθησόμενα* B., with s.

II, 14, 26 *ἀτάκτως] εὐτάκτως* B., anticipating Schweighäuser.

II, 14, 28 *ιστορήσαντ'] "ιστορήσαντας vel ιστορήσαντες"* B. In the first of the two suggestions, which is undoubtedly correct, Bentley was anticipated by Salmasius and the 'Codex Uptoni.'

II, 15, 19 *χρή] χρῆ* B., with Sc.

II, 16, 37 *παιδιὰ] παιδία* B., anticipated by Gataker. The simple change gives a better point to the passage, and Epic-

tetus was fond of drawing illustrations from the characteristics and behavior of children; see E. Renner, *Das Kind. Ein Gleichnissmittel bei Epiktet*, Festschrift . . . der Univ. München, 1905, pp. 54 ff.

II, 17, 5 *ὅπου* (*ὅσπου* S)] *ὅ που* B., with Sb; *ὅπερ* is the reading of s and Schenkl. The form in S is impossible, and Bentley's change keeps very close to it, but it would seem that *ὅσπου* of S was introduced from a marginal correction which was intended for *ὅπου* in the next line, and was incorrectly introduced by the scribe of S a little too soon, displacing the correct word at that point. This must have resembled *ὅπου*, however, and *might* have been actually *ὅ που*, although the collocation *ὅ που . . . ὅς που* is harsh, and apparently not supported by the usage of Epictetus, to judge, at all events, from Schenkl's *Index Verborum*. Very likely the correct reading here is *ὅπερ . . . ὅς που*, as Koraes suggested (and apparently Wolf).

II, 18, 17 *καθαψῶ* (*κατάψω* S)] *καταψῶ* B., with Sd.

II, 19, 14 *αὐτῶν*] *αὐτό* B., a plausible, although not necessary, emendation.

II, 19, 15 *γυμνάζεσθαι*] *χειμάζεσθαι* B., from Gellius, anticipating Schweighäuser.

II, 19, 15 *θεοὺς οῖα*] *θεούς σοι οῖα* B., an almost certain restoration of the original, in part from Gellius, who has *θεούς σοι* ā. In the unusual collocation haplography accounts for the loss of *σοι* in S, and of the letters *οι* of *οῖα* in Gellius.

II, 19, 15 *κακίας*] *κακία* B., from *κακεία* in Gellius.

II, 19, 16 *ἄρας*] *ἄρα* B., from Gellius, a distinctly inferior reading.

II, 19, 19 *τίνα ταῦτα*] *τίνα πρὸς ταῦτα* B., but the conversation is imaginary, and the introduction of *πρὸς* would seem to require the change of *ἔλεγες* to *λέγεις*, while the text is satisfactory as it stands.

II, 20, 27 *αὐτοῖς* (*αὐτούς* S)] *αὐτούς* B., anticipated by the 'Codex Uptoni.'

II, 22, 13 *συμπεπτωκότες* (*συμπεπωκότες* S and Schenkl)]

συμπεπαιχότες B., anticipated by Schegk, but anticipating Reiske and Koraes, of whom the former chose *συμπεπαικότες*, presumably as being closer to the Ms. tradition. The reading of S might be defended from a similar passage, II, 22, 37, but *συμπαίξω* is better suited to the context here, which seems to be describing the common life of brothers while children.

II, 22, 14 *ἐρωτᾶς* (*εἰρωτᾶς* S); *τῷ δ]* *εἰρώτας τόδε*; B. The words are from Euripides, *Phoen.* 621, where the MSS. have *ἰστορεῖς τόδε*; Bentley's correction, in part confirmed by S, preserves what seems to be an ancient variant in the text tradition of Euripides, although Schenkl might possibly be right in the suggestion that *ἔρως* in the next line caused it. An interlinear gloss in the Marcianus 471 of Euripides reads *πρὸς τί μ' ἐρωτᾶς τόδε*; and it is also conceivable that in some ancestor of S the same kind of gloss introduced the word here. But the value of *εἰρώτας* as a variant in Euripides is not in question, and may properly be left to Euripidean scholars. In any event Bentley has recovered it for the text of Epictetus.

II, 24, 7 *ἰδεῖν]* *ἀδειν* B., misled by the reference to music above. The text is sound as it stands.

III, I, 38 *οἱ προείπομεν]* *πρό οἱ εἴπομεν* B. (from the *Odyssey*, a 37), anticipating Upton.

III, I, 39 *αὐτῷ]* *Αἴγισθῳ* B., an incomparably better reading, since there is no antecedent for *αὐτῷ* (the last pronoun refers to Agamemnon), and a sharp contrast with *σοὶ* is required. Besides a reference to such a specific instance of divine warning without the mention of a single name would have been mystifying to the majority of almost any audience and is not in the style of Epictetus, who is never recondite but always plain-spoken in his allusions.

III, I, 39 *ἐκ τρέφειν* (*ἐκστρέφειν* S)] *ἐκτρέπειν* B., with the Salamanca edition and Wolf, but *ἐκστρέφειν* is a more drastic expression of the idea, and hence more appropriate in our author.

III, 4, 11 *νικήσω* (S?)] *νικήσει* B., with Sb (? in an erasure).

III, 7, 14 *ὅτι ἀπέχη*] *ὅτι ἄπεχε* B. The change appears to imply that §§ 13-15 contain an argument of Epicurus in behalf of successful theft, and hence would seem to require that *τί ἀπέχη* in the line above should also be changed to *ἄπεχε*, which has not been done. In any case the reading of S is preferable.

III, 7, 18 *δογματίζων τὰ καλά, ποιῶν τὰ αἰσχρά*] δ. τ. *αἰσχρά*, π. τ. *καλά* B., anticipated by Schegk, Wolf, and the 'Codex Uptoni.'

III, 7, 24 *ἐν τῷ ῥεύματι*] *τορεύματι* B., anticipated by Wolf.

III, 9, 11 *παραχόμενον*] Bentley underscored the first five letters, as though he regarded the corruption as existing there. The correct reading, *παρερχόμενον*, appears in some copies of S.

III, 10, 3 *τοῦδε . . . ῥέξας . . . ἐπιπλήσσε* (sic)] Bentley restored *πρώτου . . . ἐκπρήξας . . . ἐπιπλήσσεο* from the ordinary text of the 'Golden Verses,' a somewhat drastic way of treating variants, one or even two of which may conceivably point to a different tradition.

III, 12, 7 *ἄντιχήσω*] *ἀνατοιχήσω* B., anticipating Schweighäuser.

III, 12, 16 *ἐρῶντας*] *ἐροῦντας* B., with s.

III, 14, 3 *σκόπτει τί ποτε*] *σκόπει τί ποτε* B., anticipated by Schegk and Wolf, and anticipating Reiske, but *σκώφθητι ποτε* of S is probably correct.

III, 20, 4 *σοι*] *σοι* B., anticipating Upton.

III, 20, 8 *παύσασθε τοὺς θεοὺς ὑμῶν*] *παύσασθε, τοὺς θεοὺς ὑμῖν* B., with the Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713). Since the date of neither's notes seems to be known (for those of Shaftesbury, see Upton, Preface, p. [vi], the question of priority, somewhat idle in any event, cannot be determined.

III, 20, 9 *οὗτω*] *οὗτος* B., with s.

III, 21, 16 *ὑγιείας*] *ἀγνείας* B., with s.

III, 23, 35 *τριβωνίῳ . . . πούλβινον*] Bentley underscored both words as corrupt (the first undoubtedly is so, *τριβωναρίῳ*,

the correct reading, appearing in S), and quotes Casaubon on Persius, 1, 17, as suggesting *πούλπιτον* (as also Schegk and Wolf). But *πούλβινον* is entirely sound, being supported, as Upton saw, by the same expression in Seneca, *Cons. Marc.* 16, 2: *iuvenibus nostris pulvinum escendentibus.*

III, 24, 53 *ἀνδροέργων*] *ἀνδρὸς ἔργων* B., anticipated by Wolf (and probably Schegk).

III, 24, 62 *ἀγγενεῖς*] *ἀγεννεῖς* B., with s.

III, 24, 111 *νῦν ἀν . . . σεμνολογῶσιν*] *νῦν ἀν . . . σεμνολογῶσιν* B., with s (in part), an imperfect emendation because *ἀν* and the subjunctive are incorrect; but Bentley was right in seeing that *ἄ* was needed.

III, 24, 113 *μάρτυσι*] *μάρτυρι* B., with s.

III, 26, 37 *ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ*] *ἐν ἀνεπιτηδείῳ* B., anticipated by Wolf, a reading retained by Upton (though with qualms), and defended by Schweighäuser, but which I find unsatisfactory. Schenkl's *ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ <οὐ> νοσήσεις*; is excellent, but the reading which Bentley emended (that of S) can be defended, as Upton thought, whom Miss Carter and Mr. Matheson have followed in their translations.

IV, 1, 150 *τετυφλωμένος*] *τετυφωμένος* B., with s.

IV, 2, title *συμφορᾶς*] *συμπεριφορᾶς* B., with some later hand in S.

IV, 2, 1 *ἀνακριθῆς*] *ἀνακραθῆς* B., with s.

IV, 4, 26 *μετ' ὀλιγον (sic)*] *ὀλίγων* B., with an early corrector in S.

IV, 4, 31 *διὰ θορύβου*] *δίχα θορύβου* B., with Schegk, the Salamanca edition (margin), Wolf, and the 'Codex Uptoni.'

IV, 5, 3 *πόλου*] *Πώλου* B., with a corrector in S.

IV, 5, 24 *βλέπειν*] *βλάπτειν* B., with s.

IV, 7, 22 *διαρρυπτεῖ*] *διαρριπτεῖ* B., anticipating Schenkl.² The evidence of S on the question whether *ρίπτω* or *ριπτῶ* should be read in Epictetus is equivocal.

IV, 7, 27 *περιέρχομαι*] *περιέχωμαι* B., with Sc.

IV, 8, 32 *ώχρισαντα*] *ώχρησαντα* B. (from the *Odyssey*, λ 529), anticipating Upton.

One rises from the examination of these notes of Bentley with an increased feeling of respect for his philological acumen. Of course he had a wretched text before him, many of the errors which he detected are of the kind which any competent proofreader might correct in the ordinary round of his duties, and he was not under the compulsion, which faces an editor, of treating every difficulty which he met. But even with all these reservations, the record remains a brilliant one, and I doubt if a higher average of success in emending the text of a classical author has often, if ever, been attained.

IV. — *Literary Reminiscences in the Agricola*

BY PROFESSOR CLARENCE W. MENDELL

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE *Agricola* has always been a rich quarry for the parallel seeker. There are in the essay so many obvious reminiscences of earlier writers that it seems to be an almost inexhaustible mine. Scholars are now, however, pretty generally agreed that, taken as a whole, it marks a Sallustian period in Tacitus' literary progress, that it is in a way based on the short historical monograph as developed by Sallust, and that as such it represents the author's first tentative departure from the Ciceronian norm toward that distinctively Tacitean style which he developed in a later period.

Schoenfeld, in a Leipzig program of 1884, *De Taciti studiis Sallustianis*, discussed the general stylistic resemblances between the two historians and called especial attention to the correspondence between *Agricola*, 37 and *Jugurtha*, 101 and to numerous verbal parallels elsewhere. Thiessen, in 1912, *De Sallustii, Livii, Taciti digressionibus*, pointed out the digressions of Sallust as the source of those in Tacitus' *Agricola*. Draeger too and all of the commentators have dwelt on the relation of the later to the earlier writer.

There can be no question that the resemblances are there, no doubt that Sallust is an important source from which Tacitus drew many ideas of form, style, and expression. It is equally true that Zimmerman, *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen*, v, 1, finds in the *Agricola* an imposing number of parallels with Seneca, that Furneaux's notes call attention to rather more reminiscences of Livy than of Sallust, that the epilogue to the *Agricola* is generally conceded to echo Cicero's *de Oratore*. And there are many resemblances to still other writers.

Hendrickson's analysis of the *Agricola*, showing conclu-

sively that the history of the proconsulship in Britain in no way disqualified the essay as a eulogistic biography, should discourage the idea of finding any close imitation of the Sallustian monographs by Tacitus, for these are not examples of the encomium as is the later essay (cf. Leo, *Die griech.-röm. Biographie*, 232; and note *narrandi*, *Sall. Cat.* 4, 5).

Accepting the theory that makes the *Agricola* an encomiastic biography, we should expect to find it a carefully executed piece of rhetoric. It was not brought out hurriedly after the death of Agricola; Tacitus had taken time to elaborate his style with care. He was planning to come before the public with his *Histories* and, no matter how devoted he was to his father-in-law, his own statement in the prologue to the *Agricola* makes it reasonable to believe that he was anxious to make his audience receptive by winning their favour with this less extensive production. The best way to do this was to come before them with a piece of work done as well as he could possibly do it but done in accordance with the rules of the game as that audience understood them.

That he did this so far as the general type of his work is concerned has been demonstrated. That he did it in the matter of detailed workmanship can be demonstrated also.

Furneaux's comments may be taken as fairly typical of the generally accepted view of the relation of the *Agricola* and *Germania* to the monographs of Sallust. On page 5 of his *Germania* Furneaux states flatly that the two essays represent the Sallustian period of Tacitus as the *Dialogus* represents his Ciceronian period. On page 4 he goes so far as to say that Tacitus shows by frequent imitation throughout his writings that he considered Sallust as a model. In another place Furneaux notes the influence of Sallust in the matter of interspersing sententious maxims. On page 11 of the *Agricola* he draws attention to the fact that "all three of these works (the *Agricola*, the *Catiline*, and the *Jugurtha*) begin with a preface in which, notwithstanding all differences of circumstances and subject, not a few resemblances of tone

and sentiment are observable. Then we have in each a biographical sketch of the early career of the principal person." Furthermore he notes the parallel between the description of Britain and that of Africa, the fact that the main narrative is broken by digressions or episodes, that large space is given to speeches, and a full account given of the final battle. He admits the complete unsimilarity of the conclusions.

Before taking up these points in detail, there are certain fundamental features common to Tacitus and Sallust that are worth a moment's notice. Sallust retired in his later years, after an active if somewhat misspent life, determined to write something that should live after him. He had the ambition to rear a monument that should outlast, if not the pyramids, at least his own generation. He was forty-four years old when he published the *Catilinarian Conspiracy*. Tacitus devoted the early years of his life to political activities, of a quieter sort, to be sure, than those of Sallust and more eminently respectable. Disregarding the *Dialogus*, he too was forty-four years old when circumstances permitted him to enter his chosen field of letters. Each man came to an unaccustomed task with the deliberate intent of winning an attentive and if possible a favourable audience. Each man had command of the technical training of his day and a mastery of the literature that had gone before, and each made full and careful use of both.

There is also a somewhat deeper affinity. Tacitus was a member of the Stoic group in imperial Rome. His real heroes are the leaders of the Stoic opposition. His wrath is roused by the degeneracy of the times and his admiration reserved for the old-fashioned virtues. Sallust, after a life of more than Epicurean pleasure, either genuinely or with a wholly deceiving pose adopted the doctrines of the Stoia. His two monographs teem with the terms of Stoic philosophy: he lauds virtue and arraigns luxury, ambition, passion, miserliness, and superstition. The *Catiline*, and even more the *Jugurtha*, almost take on at times the appearance of Stoic

treatises. Nothing was more natural than for Sallust to hark back to his greatest Stoic predecessor and to borrow largely from the *Origines* of Cato. Both Suetonius and Quintilian (as well as numerous others) testify to the extent of such borrowings. It should not therefore come as a great surprise that Tacitus begins his *Agricola* with the words *clarorum virorum*, words which Cato (we have it on Cicero's authority) used at the beginning of his *Origines*. Whether or not he was influenced by Horace's *mores animique virorum clarorum* (and in view of his use of *mores* it seems likely that he was) is of secondary interest; he must have been familiar with the *Origines* and so must his readers. To the Stoic circle of his day this opening phrase was beyond doubt an ingratiating reminiscence.

In spite of these points of resemblance between the two writers, the fact must not be lost sight of that they were writing in different fields: one in the sphere of history, the other in that of biography. Nepos comes nearer to being a model for Tacitus in the way of general type than Sallust. In the introductory chapter to his *Epaminondas* he says that he is going to tell first about his subject's antecedents, then about his education, and finally about his achievements. And, formless as are the *Lives*, the one of Epaminondas presents this outline framed in a rudimentary prologue and epilogue. The *Life of Atticus* is a eulogy as consistent as the *Life of Agricola* and there can be little doubt that the lost *Life of Cato* followed the same lines. In the *Life of Cato* Tacitus may very likely have found a really congenial model. It is hardly surprising, then, to discover (even though we have not the *Cato*) numerous reminiscences of Nepos in the *Agricola*. Nor is it hard to believe, in view of these actual verbal reminiscences, that we ought to consider him a more likely model for the first century biographer than Sallust. That Tacitus so far improved on his model as to make his own work highly original is thoroughly typical of his workmanship in general.

In the matter of detailed borrowings, Tacitus culled widely.

It is easy to show how he drew on a truly remarkable number of his predecessors, and investigation into the sources of his borrowings has attracted the writers of theses and programs for generations. The interesting outcome of such study, however, is not the resulting collection of parallel passages but the understanding made possible of the kind of writer to whom Tacitus turned for help in various lines and of the way in which he handled the material that he borrowed. The first result will emerge as we proceed to examine the second.

It is clear that in producing the *Agricola* Tacitus was still something of an apprentice in the business of writing. The fact that parts of the essay are almost a patchwork composed of bits from the earlier literature shows the painstaking rhetorical student. But another point stands out just as clearly. At the game so popular in the rhetorical schools of his day, making over the fine phrases and *sententiae* of literary tradition, Tacitus was a real master. Monotonous indeed to the teacher at Rome must have been the mass of material presented by ambitious pupils. Subjects worn threadbare by repeated handling were dressed up in language that made pretence of being new and adorned with figures and epigrams and illustrations either new or more usually taken industriously from handy collections of commonplaces. The results must have been almost universally dreary. Tacitus was no longer, in 96 A.D., a pupil in the rhetor's school, but between the time when he had been one and the time when he wrote the *Agricola* he had had no opportunity to practise what he had learned in his school days. He himself, in confessing to a style untried and unskilled, recognizes the *Agricola* for what it is, the tentative first effort of a novice.

This fact must be remembered in order fully to appreciate the success that is attained in the essay. It starts with what seems to us an impossible handicap; at the end it leaves an impression not only of successful achievement and real power but of originality. Unlike the hundreds of mediocre students of his time who spent their efforts vainly flogging dead or

dying horses, Tacitus had the power so to appropriate and make over what he borrowed that in his hands it became something new, crystallized by the infusion of his genius, touched with the irony of his spirit in revolt. In all of the parallel passages that we shall examine it will rarely be true that the result of Tacitus' treatment has not been the improvement of the phrase; regularly it is Tacitus that has raised the ordinary sentence out of the ruck of the commonplace and given it the chance of immortality.

The power to do this marks the truly great literary artist moved by a compelling emotion. Tacitus was not doing tricks with words, making pretty combinations to tickle the fancy of a superficial audience. It is true that he had to appeal to the public as he found it and in ways that they understood, but he wrote from the fulness of a bitter conviction. Within him there had been growing steadily the intense hatred of a regime which had not only robbed him of a beloved father-in-law but had throttled and almost strangled the old Rome of his devoted imagination. It was the depth of emotion expressed by a master of language that created immortal phrases out of mediocre gleanings.

The familiar *vitium parvis magnisque civitatibus commune, ignorantiam recti et invidiam* is the result of the master touch applied to Nepos' more diffuse expression of the idea in *Chabrias*, 3, 3: *Est enim hoc commune vitium magnis liberisque civitatibus, ut invidia gloriae comes sit et libenter de iis detrahant quos eminere videant altius neque animo aequo pauperes alienam opulentiam intueantur.* I have quoted the whole passage, although only the first part is used by Tacitus, to show how proverbial some of these phrases became. The last part of the quotation emerges in *Velleius Paterculus*, I, 9, 6: *Quam sit adsidua eminentis fortunae comes invidia altissimisque adhaereat;* and it may have been before his mind's eye when he wrote (II. 40. 5): *Numquam eminentia invidia carent.* *Paterculus* was writing history, but history of a eulogistic nature and under the same sort of rhetorical

influence that led Tacitus to make much of the sententious remark.

More typical of the way in which Tacitus uses his borrowings are two or three other passages in the rhetorical introduction to the essay. In the second chapter Tacitus writes: *Dedimus profecto grande patientiae documentum*. If there were no further use of Curtius Rufus by Tacitus, a single resemblance would seem to be a coincidence, but we shall see later that he probably borrowed a number of phrases from the chronicler of Alexander's career. So Curtius' *singulare certe ediderunt patientiae exemplum* (x, 3, 4), with only one word unchanged, looks like the basis of the more perfect phrase of Tacitus, more perfect in that it avoids hiatus and attains a richer rhythm.

Similar is Tacitus' treatment of Cicero's *tempora timens inimica virtuti* (*Or.* 10, 35) which becomes, in *Agr.* 1, *infesta virtutibus tempora*. Finally, in the third chapter of the prologue an old idea is worked over still more thoroughly. Lucretius had written (1, 556): *Nam quidvis citius dissolvi posse videmus | Quam rursus refici*. For once, and no doubt because he has a poet as a forerunner, Tacitus has expanded rather than compressed the idea. It is not impossible that the germ of the sententious phrases that follow was found in Seneca's *tam malorum quam bonorum conversatio amorem induit* (*Tranq.* 1, 3). At any rate Seneca seems to have contributed more directly the conceits *securitas publica* and *nostri superstes* (*Ep.* 73, 2; *Tranq.* 11, 12, and *Ep.* 30, 5) and perhaps also the phrase *mortalis aevi* which he uses twice (*Cons. Marc.* 25, 1 and *Ep.* 102, 23) as well as *bona conscientia* (*Clem.* 1, 1, 1), none of them apparently commonplaces. It is not however impossible that Livy's *per tot annos, magnam partem vitae* (iv, 24, 5) is, as Golling suggests, partly responsible for Tacitus' *per quindecim annos, grande mortalis aevi spatium*. Tacitus has seized the right combination.

It will be as well to turn directly to the epilogue to get further understanding of Tacitus' methods in using the

phraseology of his predecessors. This chapter begins, as Gudeman has noted, with another reminiscence of the Stoic Seneca, this time from *Ep.* 63, 16: *si modo vera sapientium fama est recipitque nos locus aliquis.* Tacitus is again better than his source: *si quis piorum manibus locus, si, ut sapientibus placet,* etc.

But it is to Cicero and Livy that Tacitus owes most in this peroration. In the *Archias*, 12, 30, Cicero makes the contrast between the sculptured presentment of the physical body and the reproduction of the spiritual qualities: *An statuas et imagines, non animorum simulacra sed corporum, studiose multi summi homines reliquerunt; consiliorum relinquere ac virtutum nostrarum effigiem nonne multo malle debemus, summis ingeniis expressam et politam?* And Livy contributes as much in the following sentence (xxv, 38): *vos quoque velim, milites, non lamentis lacrimisque tanquam extinctos prosequi (vivunt viventque fama rerum gestarum) sed quotienscumque occurrat memoria illorum,* etc. If, finally, we consider the phraseology of Cicero, *de Or.* II, 23, 98, *suam quandam expressit quasi formam figuramque dicendi,* we shall have found most of the ideas and most of the words which go to make up this forty-sixth chapter, especially if we note how the same ideas and words were used by other writers who may have been just as well known to Tacitus. For example, Horace, *Epist.* II, 1, 248: *Nec magis expressi vultus per aenea signa | Quam per vatis opus mores animique virorum | Clarorum apparent,* and again, *cum autem exprimere imaginem consuetudinis atque vitae velimus Epaminondae* (Nepos, *Epam.* 1, 3), or finally, Velleius Paterculus, II, 66, 5, who repeats *vivit vivetque* which he presently varies with *manebit.* Perhaps Sallust, *Cat.* 8, is responsible for the idea of the importance of a biographer, best stated by Horace in *Vixere fortis ante Agamemnona.* Pliny was well pleased with the result, as shown by his imitation in the *Panegyric* (55), as well as in a letter (II, 1, 11). His sedulous imitation serves to bring out the striking success with which Tacitus made truly his own a series of commonplaces.

The helpfulness to Tacitus of Cicero's *de Oratore* was not confined to this one instance. It is especially marked in chapters 43-45, *Finis vitae eius*, etc., which are in a way part of the epilogue. In the *de Oratore*, III, 2-3, there is enough material to make extensive quotation worth while. Wex and Furneaux both note this passage.

Fuit hoc luctuosum suis, acerbum patriae, grave bonis omnibus ; sed ii tamen rem publicam casus secuti sunt, ut mihi non erepta L. Crasso a dis immortalibus vita, sed donata mors esse videatur. non vidit flagrantem Italiam bello, ardentem invidia senatum, non sceleris nefarii principes civitatis reos, etc. quis enim non iure beatam L. Crassi mortem illam, quae est a multis saepe defleta, dixerit, cum horum ipsorum sit qui tum cum illo postremum fere conlocuti sunt, eventum recordatus? tenemus enim memoria Q. Catulum, etc. ego vero te, Crasse, cum vitae flore tum mortis opportunitate divino consilio et ornatum et extinctum esse arbitror.

Outside of the more obviously rhetorical parts of the essay, the prologue and the epilogue, the most carefully wrought passages are the speeches of Calgacus and Agricola. In these it would be natural to expect much of the influence of Sallust, for it is generally agreed that the speeches and digressions in Tacitus have a distinctly Sallustian flavour. And the evidence is extensive and familiar. There is no need to recall the coincidences in the large and in detail between the speech of Catiline and the speeches of Calgacus and Agricola, nor between the scenes before and during and after the big battles. The resemblance extends to details of expression like *in armis omnia sita* in *Jug.* 51, 4 and *arma et in his omnia* in *Agr.* 33, 7 (the very slight change has given real distinction to a colourless phrase). No one has ever questioned the influence of Sallust and it is not questioned here. But it does not begin to tell the story.

Such a writer as Curtius Rufus, dealing with history but treating it as a background for his hero Alexander, would in many ways have attracted the attention of Tacitus. The

very nature of Curtius' work was congenial to Tacitus in the extreme. He was impatient of the periods of the earlier historians, a follower of the newer and tenser style; like Sallust he delighted in using words in their less common meanings; rhetorician that he was, he was not interested in the technique of battles but preferred to dwell on the more dramatic elements, especially speeches; moralising became to him a second nature. In other words, he was a typical rhetorician of the age of Claudius devoting himself to the writing of history. Tacitus, when he wrote the *Agricola*, was preparing for the publication of his *Histories* and was distinctly interested in style and rhetoric. In the *Agricola* the peculiarities of Curtius' style reappear, improved upon to be sure, but with great prominence.

In chapter 34 Tacitus makes Agricola, in his great speech before the battle, use the figure of the timid wild animals fleeing at the sound of intruders to illustrate the withdrawal of the Caledonians to the remote end of Britain: *pavida et inertia ipso agminis sono pellebantur*. In Curt. III, 8, 10 appears: *ritu ignobilium ferarum, quae strepitu praetereuntium audito silvarum latebris se occulerint*. This might readily be a coincidence. The two writers might each have thought of the same figure, which may have been a commonplace. This might be true even though the sections preceding the tenth in Curtius have a similarly familiar ring: winter is approaching and the troops cannot be divided, exactly the case in Tacitus' story after the battle. But no theory of coincidence is tenable in the face of what occurs later in Curtius. In IV, 14, 7 he gives us the speech of Alexander before the battle of Arbela. *Emensis tot terris in spem victoriae*, he begins. He tells them that the Persians *reprehensos ex fuga . . . metu exangues . . . in eodem vestigio haerere*. Agricola says that the Britains *deprehensi sunt* and that *novissimae res et extremo metu torpor defixere aciem in his vestigiis*. To Alexander, the Persians are *ex latebris suis erutos*, to Agricola, the Britains are *e latebris suis extrusi*. Both speakers

make the double appeal, of glory to the brave, of desperation to the coward. The speech of Darius follows in Curtius. The Persians (like the Britains) are going to fight for liberty. Their wives and children are at hand and Curtius applies to them the word *pignus*, so used by Tacitus but otherwise only once in Livy, in Pliny, Quintilian, and in post-Augustan poetry. There is no chance for flight; the enemy are few in number; this battle will end the war; it is their own cowardice that has hitherto helped the enemy. Finally he appeals to them: *Ite . . . ut quam gloriā accepistis a maioribus vestris posteris relinquatis.* This appeal is strikingly like the conclusion of Calgacus' speech: *Proinde ituri in aciem maiores vestros et posteros cogitate.* There is more in both speeches but the parts cited are convincing. And throughout, Tacitus' treatment has given life and power to all that he took.

It remains to notice a number of the epigrammatic phrases in the *Agricola* that seem to be the result of working over the conceits of earlier writers. In chapter 23, *laudando promptos castigando segnes*, there is pretty clear reflection of Caesar, *B. C.* i, 3: *Laudat promptos atque in posterum confirmat, segniores castigat.* Tacitus has given it character by omitting the unnecessary phrase. Again he put the final touch to a well-known sentiment with his *proinde et honesta mors turpi vita potior* (33). But Nepos gave him the line when he wrote (*Chabrias*, 4, 3): *at ille praestare honestam mortem turpi vitae.* One of Tacitus' best phrases following *iam et mare scrutantur*, chapter 30, is this: *si locuples hostis est, avari, si pauper, ambitiosi.* This is obviously a reworking of Seneca's *sive avarus dominus est mare lucri causa scrutamur, sive ambitiosus*, etc. (*Clem.* i, 3, 5). *Omne ignotum pro magnifico est* is Tacitus' own, but the idea was first put in trenchant form by Caesar, *B. C.* iii, 36, 1: *nam plerumque in novitate (rem) fama antecedit.* He contributed rather less of his own when he wrote *proprium humani ingenii est odisse quem laeseris*, for Seneca had already written (*de Ira*, ii, 33, 1): *Hoc habet*

pessimum animi magna fortuna insolentis: quos laeserunt et oderunt.

Throughout the essay there are verbal coincidences, in themselves of no particular importance, but interesting in the aggregate for what they indicate of Tacitus' methods and range of reading. Wex and Furneaux, Golling and Gudemian, Kleiber, Thiessen, Woelflin, and Zimmermann have been foremost in pointing out these verbal coincidences. It will be necessary to cite a considerable number in order to give an indication of their quality and their frequency. I will simply present the parallels without comment.

Bona conscientia, Agr. 1; Sen. Clem. I, 1, 1. Magnus atque clarus haberi, Agr. 1; Sall. Jug. 92. Loquendi audiendique commercio, Agr. 2; commercium sermonum, Liv. V, 15, 5. Monumenta clarissimorum ingeniorum, Agr. 2; Sen. Cons. Helv. 1, 2. Securitas publica, mortalis aevi, and nostri superstes in Agr. 3 have already been noted. Per mutuam caritatem, Agr. 6; Curt. VI, 7, 4. Iam vero tempora curarum remissionumque divisa: ubi conventus ac iudicia poscerent, gravis intentus severus et saepius misericors; ubi officio satis factum nulla ultra potestatis persona, Agr. 9; cum tempus posceret, laboriosus, patiens . . .; idem simulac se remiserat . . . luxuriosus, etc., Nep. Alcib. 1, 2; distinguit ratione officiorum ac temporum vicissitudinem laboris ac voluptatis, Cic. Mur. 30, 76. Ceterum Britanniam qui mortales initio coluerint, Agr. 11; Sed qui mortales initio Africam habuerint, Sall. Jug. 17, 7. Cetera egregius (of a man who shows arrogance in ruling), Agr. 16; Liv. I, 35, 6. Cruda ac viridis senectus, Agr. 29; cruda viridisque senectus, Verg. Aen. VI, 304. Fremituque et clamoribus dissonis, Agr. 33; fremitum et clamorem dissonum, Sen. Vit. Beat. 1, 2. Furto noctis, Agr. 34; furtum noctis, Curt. IV, 13, 9. Ad arma discursum, Agr. 35; Sen. de Ira, III, 2, 3. Aures verberatas, Agr. 41; aures verberantur, Sen. Cons. Marc. 19, 6. Sic Agricola simul suis virtutibus, simul vitiis aliorum in ipsam gloriam preeceps agebatur, Agr. 41; cum suis virtutibus, tum alienis vitiis magnum esse videamus, Cic. Imp.

Pomp. 23, 67 (this is a particularly good instance of the rhetorical embellishment of a phrase by Tacitus). *Praeceps in iram*, *Agr.* 42; *Liv.* xxiii, 7. *Vera bona*, *Agr.* 44; *Sen. Ep.* 98, 9 *et passim*.

These citations do not of course by any means exhaust the collection of verbal reminiscences which scholars for centuries have been finding in the *Agricola*. They are intended only to illustrate one sort of 'imitation' practised by Tacitus. Wherever he detected the possibility of effective phrasing he boldly appropriated the material and with the touch of genius made it serve his end.

The traditional criticism, represented by the comments of Furneaux quoted at the beginning of this paper, notes that the *Agricola*, the *Catiline*, and the *Jugurtha* all begin with a rhetorical introduction and then proceed to the biographical sketch of the early career of the principal person. The somewhat philosophical, altogether rhetorical introduction is common to history and biography and technical essays of all sorts. Livy and Curtius Rufus, Nepos and Vitruvius, and every other typical writer of the essay have almost universally made use of it. Furthermore, a biography like the *Agricola* could scarcely fail to proceed to a biographical sketch of the early career of the principal person. The really noteworthy point is the difference of function performed by this sketch in the three essays and the difference of approach which results. In Sallust's essays the story of the hero's early life is an insertion, admittedly outside the normal sphere of history; in the *Agricola*, it is an integral and normal part of the biography. Sallust says in *Cat.* 4, 5: *De cuius hominis moribus pauca prius explananda sunt quam initium narrandi faciam*. The facts about Catiline are distinctly introduced *before* the real subject as stated by Sallust is taken up (cf. 4, 3: *De Catilinae coniuratione quam verissime potero paucis absolvam*.) It is equally true that the *Jugurtha* is the history of an event, not a biography. Sallust says explicitly: *Bellum scripturus sum*. The sketch of Jugurtha's early life is introduced first

by way of preparation for an understanding of the real subject: *Prius quam huiusce modi rei initium expedio, pauca supra repetam.*

The difference in the *Agricola* is patent. *Hic liber*, says Tacitus, *honor Agricolae socii mei destinatus*. He could not have more clearly announced his work as a biography, especially when these words are taken in conjunction with what he said in the first part of the prologue: *narraturo mihi vitam defuncti hominis*. The early career comes then as no insertion or digression. It is a normal member of a normal biography, and the *Agricola*, beginning in good biographical style, continues in the same style throughout. Such abnormality as there is consists not in the insertion of biographical material into history but in the expansion of certain historical matter in the biography.

Nepos, *Pelop.* I, 1, recognizes the distinction clearly: *Vereor, si res explicare incipiam, ne non vitam eius narrare sed historiam videar scribere.* Tacitus, in his first two chapters, cites earlier biographers and obviously he knew Nepos. Such writers are distinct in his mind from the historians of whom he speaks elsewhere. In *Agr.* 10, 3, for example, he cites *Livius veterum, Fabius Rusticus recentium eloquentissimi auctores*; and in the *Annals*, III, 30, 3: *C. Sallustius rerum Romanorum florentissimus auctor.* It is interesting to note that this latter judgment is expressed in the *Annals*, not in the *Agricola*, and that, as we have seen, Furneaux's notes to the *Agricola* show more parallels with Livy than with Sallust in spite of the fact that the *Agricola* and the *Germania* are held by Furneaux to mark the Sallustian period of Tacitus. The tribute to Livy occurs in the *Agricola* and refers to what must have been a geographical digression,¹ the sort of thing which Tacitus is popularly supposed to have borrowed not from Livy but from Sallust.

The fifteen years of silence through which Tacitus lived to

¹ This fact was called to my attention by my colleague, Professor Floyd Harwood.

be the survivor of his own age gave him time and to spare for intensive study, and there is ample evidence in his written works that he made thorough use of it. Obviously he was attracted to the non-Ciceronian style. Cicero had in reality brought to an end the long controversy between Atticism and Asianism. His blend of the two had become the norm of Latin style and while his chief quarrel was with the Atticists it was he who put the last touch to the periodic sentence which was essentially the ideal of the purist. With Sallust begins a new controversy, that between the Ciceronian norm and the new rhetorical style. Sallust was an admirer of Cato because of Cato's brevity, a brevity which in the earlier writer was the natural outcome of his principle, *rem tene verba sequentur*, and not a rhetorical brevity. In Sallust the brevity is conscious, a rhetorical device carried to the point of obscurity. Discarding the sonorous period, Sallust sought to embellish his style by the introduction of all the rhetorical elements of surprise: conciseness, archaism, use of unusual words or of ordinary words with an unusual meaning, poetical words and figures, sententious maxims. He built, to be sure, on the foundation of Cato and Caesar, but the foundation is only just visible in the completed structure.

Rhetorical style continued after Sallust to be the recognized antagonist of the Ciceronian. Quintilian, who held a brief for Cicero, warns against it, but popular taste was with the innovators. The rhetorical training, the recitations, the whole atmosphere of literary Rome for more than a century supported the new style until Ciceronianism became itself the opposition. Curtius Rufus, Velleius Paterculus, Seneca, and finally Tacitus too were the products of the school.

The results of Tacitus' years of study, first embodied in the *Agricola*, are just what we ought to expect. For general structure he goes, not to Sallust, but to the conventional biographical model of the rhetor's school which, in spite of

real originality in treatment, he followed closely. In the historical sections he draws freely in the matter of phraseology and often of general arrangement from Livy and Sallust and also from Caesar. Striving as he did for an almost archaic brevity, he made free use of Cato, Caesar, and Nepos, and the reminiscences of these writers are frequent and clear. For rhetorical devices he had many models. The highly rhetorical description of the big battle and the impassioned speeches echo Sallust and Curtius Rufus and Velleius Paternius. For sententious maxims and poignant phrases all of the rhetorical literature was grist to his mill. Seneca contributes much; Nepos and Sallust, Curtius, Velleius Paternius, occasionally the poets Lucan and Vergil, Valerius Maximus, and probably many a lost writer contributed hints that made possible his sustained brilliancy. Even Cicero of the opposition made no mean contribution.

The *Agricola* was a deliberate rhetorical appeal to the audience of Tacitus' day. Seneca, *Contr. IX*, 1, 13, tells how Fuscus, charged with borrowing a Greek *sententia*, freely admitted the appropriation, claiming that his effort was to outdo the best. This was evidently the established practise and it is precisely what Tacitus did. He rarely borrowed word for word from any author. Regularly he improved and made his own what suited his need in the work of other men. It is this tendency toward deliberate rhetorical phrase-making that Quintilian inveighs against in his criticism (VIII, 5, 31): *Non multas plerique sententias dicunt, sed omnia tanquam sententias.* But Tacitus attained his end. He did speak many 'sentences' and in the *Agricola* the rhetoric of the day achieved real greatness.

V.—*On a Fragment of Greek Comedy Attributed to Menander*

By PROFESSOR FRANCIS G. ALLINSON

BROWN UNIVERSITY

THIS fragment of 87 lines (some of them much mutilated) is published, with an excellent commentary on many of the lines, but without translation, in the *Papiri greci e latini della Società Italiana* (P.S.I. II, 126). The authorship of Menander is there taken for granted. A. Körte also, in his interesting article (*N. Jahrb. f. klass. Alt.* XXXIX [1917]), entitled "Was verdankt die klassische Philologie den literarischen Papyrusfunden," calls it (p. 292, n. 1) "das schöne Fragment eines unbekannten Stückes, aber sicherlich von Menander." R. Herzog, moreover, (*Herm.* LI) tries, not very convincingly, to show that it is from Menander's *Epiclerus*, an identification rejected by Körte.

This much of a consensus of opinion might lead readers to expect to find it included among the fragments of Menander in the L. C. L. edition, which purports to give all the more important fragments assigned, with reasonable certainty, to Menander. The reason for excluding this fragment, of very considerable length and interesting content, was, briefly, that there do not seem to be sufficient *indicia* to make the attribution to Menander more than a reasonable guess.¹ The *indicia* available are somewhat negative: (a) The vocabulary and style do not forbid us to assume Menandrian authorship (see, as a sample, the Greek text of lines 68–87 printed below). Much stress has been laid, specifically, on the occurrence of asyndeton. Menander, as is well known, freely made use of this device. But it would be risky to claim that Menander had a patent² on asyndeton. (b) The 'belated'

¹ The writer of the L. C. L. volume, however, would have considered it desirable to add this fragment in an appendix had not the exigencies of space prohibited.

² One may glean, for example, illustrations from Kock's *Comic Fragments*, opened almost at random: e.g. III, 296, Anaxippus, frag. 1, ll. 7 ff.; III, 317, Euphron, 1, 5–10, one conjunction only among six of 'The Seven Wise Cooks'!

prologue, spoken in this fragment by personified 'Chance,' recalls of course the *post mortem*, or rather the *post tonsuram*, prologue at the end of Act I in Menander's *Periceiromene*, spoken by 'Misapprehension' ("Αγνοία"). Professor C. H. Moore³ in his extended treatment, based on this part of our fragment, of the speakers of the prologue in tragedy and comedy brings out the wide range of selection from orthodox divinities, like Apollo, to mere *pro tempore* talking delegates, like Calligeneia in the second edition of the *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes. It would be interesting to have more data than we now possess, of the effect on the context of the transfer of the prologues from the beginning to some postponed position. Anyhow it is at least open to debate whether the occasionally somewhat wooden introductions in Euripides have any dramatic advantage over a postponed prologue, as in the *Periceiromene*, unless it be that they can be more quickly and successfully forgotten. A belated explanation of vital statistics in a novel, for example, may be more welcome than a genealogical tree of a character in whom, as yet, no interest has been awakened.

Incidentally, the fact that Τύχη does not name herself until the end of the very last line of the prologue seems⁴ to give us, in this rehearsal, the very last thing in the way of prologues!

Although it is not possible to outline the plot and its details, the parts preserved contain (as a glance at the translation below will make clear): (a) The considerable fragment of the belated prologue (ll. 1-20), discussed above; (b) An

³ See two articles in *Class Phil.* II (1916): (a) pp. 1-10, Τύχη Προλογίζουσα; and (b) p. 95, a brief but stimulating discussion of the fragment itself. Professor Moore, incidentally, in connection with the authorship, allows himself only the conservative statement that the style "suggests that it may have been by Menander."

⁴ Fortune, however, as my colleague, Professor K. K. Smith, suggests, may have been easily recognized by some conventional symbol at 'her' first appearance. If so, the postponement of the name to the last word entails only a mild suspense.

(incomplete) monologue (21-32) of the miserly Smicrines, which apparently deals with the expected arrival of valuables, plate, etc., belonging (?) to his brother Chaereas, now absent from home. When the text breaks off Smicrines is also expressing his disapproval of some marriage (doubtless an important item in the plot). (c) After a lacuna comes part of a scene (33-45), in which Davus (probably) is discussing, with some unidentified person, a plot to announce to Smicrines the sudden death of Chaereas, the feigned death being made plausible by a physician's certification. This is intended to exert pressure upon Smicrines in some matter, perhaps in reference to the marriage. (d) After the interlude of the 'Chorus' a new 'act' opens with another short monologue (47-54) by Smicrines, who is anticipating the actual possession of the valuables to be delivered by Davus and the slaves who are now approaching. (e) And finally (at line 55), Davus enters and delivers, as if alone, a preamble intended to puzzle and prepare the listening Smicrines.

Lines 60-68 are unfortunately so broken that their content must be partly inferred from what follows. Davus, however, soon (l. 63) allows himself to become aware of Smicrines and then enters upon the congenial task of irritating the miserly old man beyond the limits of endurance by a farrago of saws and citations, theatrically patched together from tragedy, as he leads up to the announcement of the faked death of the brother, Chaereas.

This part⁵ of the fragment seems to the present writer to offer the most suggestive matter for comparison with Menander's methods as they have partially emerged from the longer fragments now restored to us. Yet the clue is, at the same time, elusive in our present state of half-knowledge. Is it in keeping, we may ask, with Menander's usual restraint, as we know it, to push any device so far? It would be precarious to answer in the negative, and to editors who would in-

⁵ As the Greek text of ll. 47-59 is practically intact, the Greek for ll. 60-87 only is appended below to a translation of the whole fragment.

ject more of the farcical elements into *The Girl from Samos*, for example, it would certainly not seem out of character.

Passing over, for a moment, the broken or vacant lines (60-69), the first citation fully preserved (70), made by the nagging slave, is verbatim from Aeschylus, *Niobe*, frag. 156; the interrupted sentiment, 73-75, is expressly attributed to Carcinus (a fragment not otherwise known); the continuation, "for in a day God makes the lucky luckless," is evidently a stock phrase from tragedy (see notes below); the citation in 82-83 is verbatim from the opening of the *Orestes* of Euripides; and finally, the climax, stamped, with mock solemnity, 'made by Euripides,' is (it seems probable to me, pending any more exact identification) an offhand rehash of the familiar tag appended, with variants, to five of the plays of Euripides. It would be entirely in keeping with the slave's burlesque solemnity to use this tragic 'tailpiece' as a last fling and to insist upon the canonical Euripidean provenance of a sentiment as neutral as the soup stock which the art of the cook may differentiate into mulligatawny or mockturtle.

To these actual citations we must prefix, in the broken lines (60-69), at least two or three more (the interruption by Smicrines, 72, shows that several have preceded) and these may be filled out by more or less hazardous guesses (see below, text and notes, for suggested supplements). The sheer luxuriance of this nagging, however amusing, verges on horseplay.

To take the passage from Menander which most obviously suggests itself for comparison, we find in the closing scene (as now preserved) of the *Epitrepones* (910-914, p. 122 L. C. L.) the same device managed with far greater restraint.

There the old crone, Sophrona, appealed to by Smicrines, *in re* his sudden grandchild, says:

" 'Tis Nature willed it, unto whom no law's a bar,
And just for this was woman born."

SMICRINES

What's that? You're daft?

SOPHRONA

From Auge I'll declaim a tragic speech entire,
If you don't sometime soon wake up, O Smicrines.

Here Menander, more subtly, contents himself with the one citation, followed up by a *threat* of more. The source is suggested by the casual mention of the title. He does not intrude on his intelligent audience the name of the writer, e.g., "This is by Carcinus, this by Euripides." But, without the context in this *P.S.I.* fragment, it would be rash to dogmatise about the net literary quality of the whole scene. Just because of its obviousness the didactic citing of an author by name might, on occasion, be more comic than the subtler allusion. Or again (as in the last *P.S.I.* citation), the fun may consist in attributing to Euripides what the audience is supposed to know perfectly well as a banal commonplace.

But then, as now, a skilful author would know his audience and steer a safe course between the didactic and too great allusiveness, just as we may resent the translation of a French or Latin phrase but feel irritated, for example, when Sir Edwin Arnold peppers us with untranslated Prakrit or Hindu words.

TRANSLATION OF LINES 1-87

(The lines are numbered without regard to what preceded or to the lacunae. When the fragment begins *Tύχη* is completing the 'belated' prologue.)

FORTUNE

[I think now that you ⁶] have all [the rest, but you must]

⁶ The supplements given in brackets, unless otherwise noted, are based upon conjectures made by the present transcriber or adopted or discussed in the admirable commentary of Signor Vitelli, the editor of *P.S.I.* II, 126, to which the reference is here made, both for these details and for the Greek text down to l. 50. The Greek itself for ll. 60-87 is given below.

know this. [He lives] in solitary wise (*μονότροπος*⁷) with an old crone [as his only servant] but (here) where⁸ I have entered . . . this miser's (*φιλαργύρου*⁷) younger brother, a relative akin [as it happens] to the young man, very excellent in character and rich, dwells with his wife and is father of one maiden. [With him⁹] the young fellow¹⁰ [left¹⁰] his sister still young . . . the girls themselves have been reared [by themselves]. Now being, as I said before, an excellent man . . . [he is off¹¹ on] . . . a journey away from home . . . dwells . . . absolutely was intending to settle the maiden (still) young in marriage . . . with his¹⁵ wife's son (begotten) by another husband [now dead¹²] of course.

(*Lacuna of at least 10 lines*)

¹⁷ [For thus I will show] him up what sort of man he is . . . in regard to the capital sums.¹³ It remains to tell my name, who I am, mistress of all these things to arbitrate²⁰ and regulate, namely, Fortune.¹⁴

(*Exit Prologue.*)

Scene —.

SMICRINES

To prevent anyone from saying of me that I am very miserly I have readily allowed them to bring (things) in here without examining how much gold plate (or coin?) it is that one bears, nor even how much silver plate nor even exacting the enumeration from anyone. I say this, for people are wont to malign me in everything. For this minute accuracy (of mine) will be in evidence as long as it's house slaves who do the carrying. I think, indeed,

⁷ Signor Vitelli rejects the suggestion that either of these words formed the title.

⁸ Reading (not *σὺ*, but) *οὐ δ'* with De Stefani and Wilam.

⁹ Reading *παρ' ϕ* with De Stefani. This, however, is rejected by Vitelli.

¹⁰ *κατέ[λιπεν]* Körte.

¹¹ *Exempli gratia.*

¹² *ἀποθανόντος* — rather long.

¹³ *τάρχαῖα*, as in Ar. *Nub.* 1156, Vitelli; but Wilam. reads [*νένευκε]ν* *ἐπὶ τάρχαῖα*, 'he is inclined to the good, old ways.'

¹⁴ *Τυχῆι* in Ms., as if dat.

that they will voluntarily abide by law and justice; but
 30 if they do not, no one is going to allow (them to steal).

But I wish to forbid them to carry out this marriage
 that is going on. Now perhaps it's an outlandish thing
 32 actually to say: "Not in marriage . . .

(*Lacuna of 2 or more leaves*)

32-34 (*nearly blank*)

DAVUS (?)

35 Now I have planned for him [to suffer] this, to die [some-
 how] by chance.

(A)

I shall see to it that you do not [get a flogging].¹⁵

DAVUS (?)

I, indeed, am letting myself¹⁶ go. So do you manfully
 look out for the affair.

(A)

Who is to be privy to it with us?

DAVUS (?)

We must tell the lady only and the (two) girls themselves
 40 to prevent their weeping, but must allow the others in-
 doors to play drunken tricks on me on the supposition
 that . . .¹⁷

(A)

Right you are in what you say. Let some one lead in
 this one here.¹⁸ It is permitted(?)¹⁹ Of course the mal-
 ady is not going to admit of delay and agony [if . . . and
 45 if] the physician has some plausible²⁰ [pretext] for us.

(*Chorus*)

¹⁵ Reading $\mu\eta\delta[\alpha\rho\hat{\eta}s]$ cited from Diels. ¹⁶ $\delta\phi\iota\epsilon\mu'$ not $\delta\phi\iota\eta\mu'$ Vitelli.

¹⁷ . . . $\kappa\ldots\tau\epsilon\rho\kappa\delta\tau$ Körte, $\kappa\kappa\kappa\tau$ Pistelli and Wilam.

¹⁸ "Un uomo di paglia" (metaphorically) representing the absent Chaereas (Vitelli).

¹⁹ A mark of interrogation, perhaps, gives sense.

²⁰ $\pi\iota\theta\alpha\eta\delta[\tau\eta\tau]\alpha\sigma\chi\hat{\eta}\tau\iota\tau\alpha$ suppl. Vitelli. "Also soll der Arzt eine praesentable Todesursache erfinden," Wilam.

ACT —

Scene —. *Enter DAVUS (with companions)*

SMICRINES (*aside*)

47 Davus has come quickly indeed bringing to me a list of the valuables and he has been very thoughtful for me.
 50 Davus is with them. Well, by Zeus, he did do nobly. I am well pleased to have a pretext in his case, so as to be scrutinizing these things no longer altruistically, but conformably to my own interests. For of course the undeclared (valuables) are twice the amount. I know the arts of this runaway!

DAVUS (*as if in monologue*)

55 O ye divinities! Frightful in truth, by Helius, is this that has happened! I could never have supposed that a human being would fall so quickly into such a calamity! A regular blasting bolt has fallen upon the house.

SMICRINES (*aside*)

59 What in the world does he mean?

(*For supplements here made, merely by way of suggestion, to indicate the course of the dialogue in the broken lines 60-68, see notes on the Greek text below. At about line 63 Davus allows himself to become aware of Smicrines and proceeds to reduce him by literary compresses.*)

60-64 . . . (*unintelligible*). . . .

DAVUS

65 ["There is naught that comes to man apart from gods"]
 66 . . . ?
 67 ["There is not a man who is fortunate in all respects."]
 68 [For there is no possible device for anyone to continue]
 69 unsmitten by trouble; [there is no resource in dexterous
 70 bluffing], none in good counsel. And, you know, "God im-

plants guilt in mortals whenever he is fain utterly to destroy a household."

SMICRINES

[Why] do you string [so] many [irrational] maxims together, you triple wretch?

DAVUS

"There is no terror that is irrational—"

SMICRINES (*aside*)

Will he never call a halt?

DAVUS (*continuing, unchecked*)

75 — "nor even beyond belief, of all mortal ills," as Carcinus somewhere remarks. "For in a day's span God makes the lucky luckless." You shall have the whole story, Smicrines.

SMICRINES

Now what are you talking about?

DAVUS

Your brother — O Zeus, how shall I say it? — pretty nearly this: your brother is dead and gone, while wishing just now — here — to me —

SMICRINES

80 Why, what befell him?

DAVUS

Gall! Grief! A mind distraught! Suffocation!

SMICRINES

Gods and Poseidon, what a terrible thing to suffer!

DAVUS (*falling back on Euripides*)

"There is no tale so terrible to tell, no suffering, (nor—)"

SMICRINES (*interrupting*)

You make me tired!

DAVUS (*switching off from the Orestes*)

"For," as I was about to say, "the deities decree mis-
haps past expectation." *That's* from Euripides! No mere
85 everyday writer invented that!

SMICRINES

But was some physician called in?

DAVUS (*answers by a sign*)²¹

SMICRINES (*continues*)

Well, well! Then Chaereas is gone! . . .

(*End of fragment.*)

TEXT OF LINES 60-87

60 and 61 are vacant.

62 μονονθα . . . ν [.]
 63 [.] αρα
 64 [ā]νθρωπον
 65 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδ
 66 παρανευ
 67 " [οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις πάντ' ἀνὴρ εὐδαιμονεῖ.] "
 68 [οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως μενεῖ γὰρ ἀ]βλαβὴς πόνου
 69 [εὐτραπελία] δ' οὐ[κ] ἔστιν, οὐκ εὐβουλία.
 70 καὶ δ[ὴ] "θε]ὸς μὲν αἰτίαν φύει βρότοις
 ὅταν κακῶσαι δῶμα παμπήδην θέλῃ."

²¹ And, probably, of assent. The οὐδεῖς of the Ms. would not only spoil the metre but would also be inconsistent with the plan indicated above in l. 45.

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

[τί ἄλογα σὺ τ]όσα γνωμολογεῖς, τρισάθλιε;

ΔΑΟΣ

οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλογον δεινόν

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

οὐδὲ παύσεται;

ΔΑΟΣ

“οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἄπιστον τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακῶν,”

75 [ώς] Καρκίν[ο]ς πού φησ<ιν>· ἐν γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ
τὸν εύτυχ[η τίθη]σι δυστυχῆ θεός.”
σὺ πάντα δ’ [εἴση, Σ]μικρίνη.

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

λέγεις δὲ τί;

ΔΑΟΣ

ἀδελφός — ὁ Ζεῦ, πῶς φράσω; σχεδόν τι — σοῦ
τέθυηκεν, ἐθέλων ἀρτίως ἐνταῦθ’ ἐμοὶ —

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

80 τί παθῶν;

ΔΑΟΣ

χολή, λύπη τις, ἔκστασις φρενῶν,
πνιγμός.

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

Πόσειδον καὶ θεοί, δεινοῦ πάθους.

ΔΑΟΣ

“οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν δειν[ὸν] ὡδὸς εἰπεῖν ἔπος
οὐδὲ πάθος —”

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

ἀποκναίει[σ σ]ύ.

ΔΑΟΣ

“τὰς γὰρ συμφορὰς

ἀπροσδοκήτους δαίμον[ει δι]ώρισαν.”

85 Εύριπίδου τοῦτ’ ἔστι. το[ὺξε]νρημένον
οὐ τῶν τυχόντων.

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

εἰσελήλυθ[εν] δέ τις

ιατρός;

ΔΑΟΣ

ΣΜΙΚΡΙΝΗΣ

οἴχεται μὲν οὖν ὁ Χαιρέας

(End of fragment.)

64 Probably part of a tragic citation. 65 If we may assume that the unintelligible syllables, παρανευ (?) in 66, mark either an interruption by Smicrines or Davus's own words, after a quotation in line 65, it would be possible to restore the line by one of the following citations from Euripides: (a) *Hec.* 805, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδ[ἐν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ισον] or (b) *Thyest.* frag. 6, 398 Dindorf, which would also fit the letters, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδ[ἐν χωρὶς ἀνθρώποις θεῶν]. 66 παρανευ T. Lodi, πάλιν εὐ M. Norsa. 67 This line, blank in the papyrus, is restored, *exempli gratia*, from a citation from Euripides imbedded in Pheidipp. Φιλάδελφοι, frag. 18 K. III, 306. 68 οὐκ — to γὰρ suppl. *exempli gratia*, to make a transition to 69. ἀ]βλαβῆς T. Lodi. 69 Suppl. (tentatively) Vitelli; εὐανδρία (2 letters short) Wilam. 70-71 Aesch. *Niobe*, frag. 156 (Vitelli). 72 τί ἀλογα ταῦτα Wilam. (before the letters οσα were reported); ἀλογα gives cue for ἀλογον in 73. 75 Carcinus citation not otherwise known. φησ' ἐν μιᾷ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ Ms., corr. Wilam. *metri causa*. Vitelli compares *Philem.* 213, 7 f. K. II, 534, for the thought; for both the sentiment and the use of ἐν ἡμέρᾳ + μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ see also Menand. *Periceir.* 685 and 682 (p. 266 L. C. L.). 80 τί παθῶν; cf. *Od.* xxiv, 106. 82-83 From Eur. *Or.* 1-2. Note that δεινόν and πάθος weave in, as if by a cue, both words of the exclamation in 81. Cf. [ἀλογα] 72 with ἀλογον, 73. 83-84 τὰς—δι]ώρισαν. Of this hackneyed banality, triumphantly labelled by Davus as "made by Euripides," Vitelli says: "Sono certamente parole di Euripide." Possibly they are the exact words from some passage not yet identified. Pending any other identification, however, it may well be that Davus, switched off from his citation from the *Orestes*, chooses to bring his horseplay to a conclusion by a garbled citation, in trimeter, of the anapaestic tag appended to the end of the *Medea* (and four other plays). His vociferous claim (85-86) that this is 'simon-pure' Euripidean, not tacked on by any ordinary actor-fellows, might, conceivably, have amused a contemporary audience. The anapaests in question, *Medea*, 1416-1418, are:

πολλὰ δ' ἀέλπτως κραίνουσι θεοί·
καὶ τὰ δοκηθέντ' οὐκ ἐτελέσθη,
τῶν δ' ἀδοκήτων πόρον ηῦρε θεός.

The hackneyed sentiment about the shifts of Fortune is reiterated in each line. That ἀπροσδοκήτους, unmanageable in the anapaests, displaces the

ἀδόκητος of the tag would give Davus little concern. For *κραίνουσι* we have the gnomic [δι]ώρισαν, twice employed by Sophocles in *O. T.* (the objection raised by Vitelli against the compound seems unnecessary). 87 *ιατρός*: *οὐδεὶς*. *οἴχεται* μὲν *οὖν* δ *Χαιρέας* Ms.; Körte disposes of the superfluous foot by reading *οἴχετ' οὖν* δ *Χ.* It seems best, with Vitelli, to omit *οὐδεὶς*, and to assume that Davus replies only by a sign. It should also be emphasized (see above) that the insertion of the negative *οὐδεὶς* would imply a contradiction to l. 45. This consideration, to the present writer, seems decisive as to the best method of curing the metre. The apparently otiose *μέν*, eliminated by Körte's cure, would doubtless be taken care of by the context, now lost.

VI.—*Two Contracts for Division of Property from Graeco-Roman Egypt*

BY PROFESSOR A. E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE two documents which I propose to discuss briefly in this paper are the pair of contracts inventoried as numbers 99 and 98 of the Michigan papyrus collection.

These documents belong to the general class of *δημόσιοι χρηματισμοί* or public deeds, that is, documents the registration of which at some public record office was obligatory. The prescribed place of registration for the majority of these documents was the office of the agoranomus, or public notary. This official, in Roman Egypt, was in direct charge of the central record office (the *ἀγορανόμιον*) which was situated at the administrative center of each nome. The other towns and villages of the nomes had branch record offices called, as a rule, *γραφεῖα*, which were in charge of officials under the control of the agoranomus (cf. P. M. Meyer, *Juristische Papyri*, 86 ff.).

Deeds which were to be registered at one of these offices were regularly drawn up in the legal form by the official in charge or by one of his clerks. Several copies of each document were made. Each party to the transaction received one, and one was preserved by the record office. From the latter additional copies and abstracts were made for the official records. Finally, a register or summary list of deeds entered at a record office in any given year was compiled at the end of that year. Such a register was called an *ἀναγραφὴ συμβολαιῶν*. One of these, the *ἀναγραφὴ* of the *γραφεῖον* of the villages of Tebtunis and Cercesuchon Oros for 41/42 A.D., is now in the Michigan collection.

All documents registered at the *ἀγορανόμια* and *γραφεῖα* may be conveniently designated as agoronomic, but at these offices they were classified under various heads on the basis

of their form and content. One of the commonest classes was that of the *όμολογίαι*, so called from their use of the verb *όμολογεῖν* to express the consent of the contracting parties to the terms set forth therein. The two contracts before us are *homologiae*, or, to describe them still more specifically, *ομολογίαι διαιρέσεως*.

All agoranomic documents, including the *homologiae*, contained the following elements. (1) The main document. This was divided into two parts, (a) the date and place of registration, and (b) the transaction. (2) The *subscriptiones*, or declarations, of the parties to the transaction. (3) The statement of the official through whose agency the document was registered (Meyer, *op. cit.* 88-89). All of these elements will be clearly recognized in the documents under consideration.

With this introduction in mind, we may proceed to an examination of the documents themselves. After briefly describing them, I shall give the text and a translation of each, and then discuss their relation to each other.

Papyrus no. 99 is 11 inches long and 7 inches wide. It has the contract on the recto, and on the verso a brief notation of its character such as might have been entered in the annual register mentioned above. The text of the document covers 43 lines. Of these, the main document occupies ll. 1-30; the declarations of the parties to the contract take up ll. 31-41; and the statement of the clerk of the record office fills the last two lines. The main document and the last statement were written by the same hand, that of the registry clerk, while the declarations are in the handwriting of two persons who are not the contracting parties themselves, but their representatives, since the former were illiterate. The papyrus is in good condition: a few of the lines are blurred or broken at the extreme right, the first two letters of ll. 2-20 are missing, and there are a few breaks in the body of the sheet, but these gaps admit of ready and certain restoration.

Papyrus no. 98 is of about the same size as no. 99, being $10\frac{1}{2}$ by $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. As in the previous case the recto contains the contract and the verso a notation of its content. The writing on the recto occupies 46 lines, which are considerably longer than those in no. 99. Although in a more fragile condition than the latter, this papyrus has even fewer lacunae in the text, and these, with one exception, can be filled in successfully with very little trouble. Of the 46 lines of text, the first 32 form the main document; ll. 32-45 are occupied by the declarations of the parties to the contract; and the statement of the registry clerk is given in the latter part of l. 45 and in l. 46. The body of the document and this statement, as in no. 99, are in the same hand, that of the registry clerk. However, although both contracts were drawn up at the same office at no very great interval, it is obvious that they were written by different clerks, for the penmanship and orthography differ markedly in each. The declarations of the contracting parties, as before, are in the hands of two signatories who are not the principals, for these are the same illiterate persons who figure in no. 99. One of these representatives was one of the signatories of the latter document.

PAPYRUS No. 99

In the transcripts of the original documents [] indicates a gap in the text; (), the completion of an abbreviation; < >, an erroneous omission by the writer; << >>, an erroneous insertion by the writer. A dot below a letter shows that it cannot be read with certainty.

κσ

ι "Ετους τετάρτου αὐτοκράτορος καίσαρος Οὐεσπασιανοῦ
σεβαστοῦ, μηνὸς Ξα[νδίκου]
ἔκ]τη καὶ είκοστή, Μεχεὶρ κσ. ἐν Βακχιάδει τῆς Ἡρακ-
λείδου μερίδος [τοῦ Ἀρ-
σι]νοείτου νομοῦ. ὁμολογοῦσι ἀλλήλοις Ὁρίων Ὁρίονος
τοῦ Μενχείου[ς
ώς] ἐτῶν ἑξήκοντα ἐννέα, οὐλὴ μετώπωι μέσωι, καὶ Ὁρος
"Ορου τοῦ Πετεύρε[ος ώς

5 ἑτῶν τριάκοντα ἐνν]^αέα, οὐλὴ καμπὴ χιρὸς δεξιᾶς, οἱ δύω, διειρῆσθαι πρὸς [έαυτοὺς
 ἀπ]^ατῆς ἐνεστώσης ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐ[τοῖς
 μέ]^{ρη} πατρικῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ αὐτῶν ἅπερ ἐστὶν τέταρτον
 μέρος καὶ τρί-
 τ]^{ρε}ον ἀπὸ δωδεκάτου μέρους, ὃ ἐστιν τριακοστέκτον μέρος
 κοινῶν καὶ [ἀδιαι-
 ρέ]^{των} ὅντων ἐν τρισὶ σφραγῖσι ἐν τῇ προγεγραμμένῃ κώμῃ
 Βακχιάδ[ει
 10 ἐν τ]^ῇ λεγομένῃ Βορρίτου λαύρᾳ, ὡν πάντων αἱ γειτονείαι διὰ τῶν περ[ὶ τού-
 τ]^{των} οἰκονομιῶν δηλοῦνται. καὶ ἐξ ἣς πεποίηνται πρὸς έαυτοὺς ἐξ[ευδο-
 κούντων ἐκ κλήρου διαιρέσεως καὶ λ[ε]^λογχέναι τὸν μὲν
 'Ωρίωνα ε[ἰς τὸ
 ἐπίβαλλον αὐτῷ μέρος τὸ προγεγραμμένον τέταρτον μέρος
 τῶν οἰκο-
 πέδων καὶ αὐτῶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀδιαιρετον, τὸν δὲ Ὡρον καὶ αὐτὸν
 λελογ-
 15 χέναι εἰς τὸ καὶ αὐτῷ ἐπίβαλλον μέρος τὸ προγεγραμμένον
 τρίτον τοῦ
 δωδεκάτου μέρους, ὃ ἐστιν τριακοστέκτον μέρος τῶν αὐτῶν
 οἰκοπέδων
 καὶ αὐτῶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀδιαιρετον, ὡν ἐστιν τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ὡρον καὶ
 τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ
 αὐτοῦ, ὡς προφέρονται ἐνφερόμενοι, ἄλλο πατρικὸν δωδέκατον
 μέ]^{ρος}
 τῶν αὐτῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ αὐτῶν. ἐνμενέτωσαν οὖν οἱ ὁμολογοῦν-
 20 τες καὶ οἱ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν διαιρεσιν ταύτην,
 σημαι-
 νομένοις πᾶσι καὶ μηδὲ εἶναι αὐτοῖς μηδὲ τοῖς παρ' αὐτῶν
 ἀθετῆσαί τι
 τῶν διειρημένων, ἀλλὰ δὲ καὶ ἔκαστον αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς παρ'
 αὐτῶν μετα-
 λημψομένους κύριεύειν καὶ δεσπόζειν ὡν ἔκαστος κεκλήρωται
 καθὼς

πρόκιται, καὶ χρᾶσθαι ἕκαστον καθ' ὃν ἐὰν βούληται τρόπον ἀπαραποδίστως.

25 καὶ πρὸς τὰ διειρημένα μηδένα αὐτῶν ἐνκαλέσιν τῷ ἐτέρῳ μηδὲ ἐπε[λεύ-

σεσθαι τρόπῳ μηδενὶ παρευρέσι μηδεμεία. ὅτι δ' ἀν τῶν προγεγραμμένων

παραβῆ τ[ις] αὐτῶν, ἀποτισάτω ὁ παραβὰς τῷ ἐνμένοντι παραχρῆμα τὰ βλά-

βη διπλᾶ καὶ ἐπίτιμον ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς διακοσίας καὶ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τὰς ἵστας

καὶ μηδὲν ἡσσον ἡ διαιρεσις ἥδε κυρίᾳ ἔστω ἐπὶ τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον. ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ὁρίου(ς) Διόσ-

30 κορος υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὡς (ἐτῶν) λγ, οὐ(λὴ) ὄφρύει δεξιᾶ, τοῦ Ὁρ[ου Ἀμμόν]ειος Πτολεμαίου ὡς (ἐτῶν) ν, οὐ(λὴ) μήλω δεξιῶι.

(2d hand.) Ὁρίων Ὁρίωνος τοῦ Με(ν)χῆος ὁμολογῶι ἀνενη-
νοχέναι πρὸς

Ὁρε Ὁρεν τοῦ Πετεύριος τὴν διέρεσιν τῶν προγεγραμμένων μερῶν τῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ α<ὺ>τῶν καὶ α(ύτὸς) κεκλήρομε τὲ τέταρτον

μέρος, καὶ ὁ Ὁρος κεκλήροται τὸ τρίτεν τοῦ δωδεκάτου μέρου-
35 ος, ὃ ἔστιν τριακοστέκτον μέρος, καὶ ε<ὺ>δοκῶι πᾶσι τῆς προ-
κιμ[ένοι-

ς καθὸς πρόκιται. ἔγραψεν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Διόσκορος υ<ὶ>ὸς διὰ τὸ [μὴ ἴδε-

νε αὐτὸν γράμματα. (3d hand.) Ὁρος Ὁρου τοῦ Πετεύριος ὁμολογῶ

συνανενυχέναι τὴν διαιρεσιν καὶ κεκλήρωμαι [τὸ τρί-
τον τοῦ δωδεκάτου <μέρους>, ὃ ἔστιν τριακοστέκτον μέρος,
40 καὶ εύδοκῶ πᾶσι τοῖς προκυμένοις καθὼς πρόκυται. ἔγρα-
ψεν ὑ(πὲρ) αὐτοῦ Ἀμμόνιος Πτολυμαίου μὴ ἴδότος γράμματα.

(1st hand.) Ἔτους τετάρτου αὐτοκράτορος καίσαρος Οὐεσ-
πασιανοῦ σεβαστοῦ, Μεχεὶρ κσ, ἀνα-
γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ πρὸς τῷ γραφίῳ Βαχίαδ(ος) καὶ
Ἡφ(αιστίαδος).

The number $\kappa\sigma$ (26) placed above the first line of the contract is the same as the day of the month upon which the latter was drawn up (cf. l. 2). It was probably written here for the convenience of the person who was to enter this contract under the proper date in the *ἀναγραφή* for the year. No. 98 has no corresponding notation. 5 διηρῆσθαι cf. ll. 22, 25. 7 καὶ αὐτῶν Here the literal translation would be "and of these what constitutes," etc. So also in 98, 6. Elsewhere (99, 14, 17, 19, 33; 98, 11, 13, 14, 16-18) it seems to be merely a redundant phrase repeated because of its previous close association with *πατρικῶν οἰκοπέδων*. For this reason I have omitted it in the translation. 20 τηντε so the text; τήνδε (?). 21-23 τοῖς παρ' αὐτῶν . . . τοῖς αὐτῶν μεταλημένοις The distinction between these two phrases seems to be that *οἱ παρ' αὐτῶν* refers to the legal heirs, while *οἱ παρ' αὐτῶν μεταλημένοι* includes both the legal heirs and any persons to whom the rights of the contracting parties may otherwise be transferred; cf. Mitteis-Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, II, 2, p. 278; Berger, *Strafclauseln in den Papyrusurkunden*, 64 f. 25 ἐνκαλέσιν = ἐγκαλέσειν No. 99, l. 24 has ἐνκαλεῖν μηδὲ ἐνκαλέσειν. The more usual formula seems to be ἐνκαλεῖν μηδὲ ἐπελεύσεσθαι. 29 μηδὲν ἡσσον goes with what follows, not with what precedes. The meaning is that in spite of the failure of one of the contracting parties to keep the terms of the agreement, and in spite of the consequent penalties, the contract shall be none the less valid. That is to say, neither party shall be able to abrogate the contract simply by failing to keep its terms and voluntarily incurring the resultant penalties. A very good parallel is found in *Pap. Amh.* 96, 10: καὶ μηδὲν ἡσσον ἡ πράσις κυρία; cf. also *ib.* 95, 11; *Pap. Ryl.* 156, 18; and *P.S.I.* I, 66, 34. 33 κεκλήρωμαι τό. 35 δ // τοῖς. 41 εἰδότος.

TRANSLATION

The fourth year of Imperator Caesar Vespasianus Augustus,
the 26th of the month Xandicus, Mecheir 26, at Bacchias in the
division of Heraclides of the Arsinoite nome.

Horion, son of Horion, son of Menches, about sixty-nine years old, with a scar in the middle of his forehead, and Horus, son of Horus, son of Peteuris, about thirty-nine years old, with a scar on the right wrist, both of them, acknowledge that they have divided between themselves from the present day for all time the portions which they have of building sites owned by their fathers, that is, what constitutes a fourth and a third of a twelfth, which is one thirty-sixth, of these sites, which are common and undivided in three sections in the aforesaid village Bacchias, in the lane called 'of Borrites'; the boundaries of all of which are set forth in the deeds relating to them.

And in accordance with the division by lot which they have made by agreement between themselves, Horion on the one hand has obtained as the share which falls to him the aforesaid common and undivided fourth part of the building sites; and on the other hand Horus himself has obtained as the share falling to him the aforesaid third of a twelfth, which is the common and undivided thirty-sixth part of the same building sites; of which same building sites, as the parties concerned declare, the same Horus and his brother hold another twelfth part which belonged to their father.

Accordingly, let the contracting parties and their heirs observe all the terms which are set forth regarding this division. And neither may they nor their heirs set aside any part of the terms of division, but each of them and their assigns shall hold and control what each has obtained by lot, just as is set forth, and each of them shall make use thereof in whatsoever way he may desire without restriction.

And with respect to what has been divided, neither of them shall accuse the other nor proceed against him in any way upon any false pretext.

And if one of them breaks the aforesaid terms in any particular, let the transgressor immediately pay to the one who abides by them double damages and a fine of two hundred drachmas in silver, and an equal sum to the treasury, and let this division be none the less valid in perpetuity.

(The signatories are): for Horion, Dioscorus his son, about thirty-three years old, with a scar on his right eyebrow; for Horus, Ammonius, son of Ptolemaeus, about fifty years old, with a scar on his right cheek.

(*2d hand.*) I, Horion, son of Horion, son of Menches, acknowledge that I have made with Horus, son of Horus, son of Peteuris, the division of the aforesaid parts of the building sites. And I have myself received by lot the fourth, and Horus has received the third of the twelfth, which is the thirty-sixth part, and I consent to all the above terms, just as they stand. Dioscorus, his son, wrote for him, because he is illiterate.

(*3d hand.*) I, Horus, son of Horus, son of Peteuris, acknowledge that I have made the division. And I have obtained by lot the third of the twelfth, which is the thirty-sixth part, and I con-

sent to all the above terms just as they stand. Ammonius, son of Ptolemaeus, wrote for him, since he is illiterate.

(*1st hand.*) The fourth year of Imperator Caesar Vespasianus Augustus, Mecheir 26. Registered through the clerk of the record office of Bacchias and Hephaestias.

PAPYRUS No. 98

1 "Ετους ἑβδόμου αὐτοκράτορος καίσαρος Οὐεσπασιανοῦ σεβαστοῦ, μηνὸς Καισαρείου ἐπαγομένων δευτέρα. ἐν Βακχειάδει τῆς Ἡρακλείδου μερίδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοείτου νομοῦ. ὁμολογοῦ[σι] ἀλλήλοις Ὄριων Ὄριωνος τοῦ Μενχείους ὡς ἐτῶν [έ]βδομή- κοντα, οὐλὴ μετώπω μέσω, καὶ "Ω[ρος"Ωρου τοῦ Πετεύριος ὡς ἐτῶν τεσσάρκοντα, δύο, οὐλὴ κα[μπὴ χι]ρὸς δεξιᾶς, οἱ δύ[ο διειρή]σθαι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς [ἀπὸ τῆς 5 ἐνεστώσης ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς μέρη πατρεικῶν οἰκο[πέδων καὶ αὐτῶν ἄπερ ἐστεὶν τέταρτον μέρος καὶ τρίτον ἀπὸ δοδεκάτου μέρους, ὃ ἐστειν τριακοστέκτον μέρος κοινῶν καὶ ἀδιαιρέτων δυντων ἐν τρισὶ σφραγῖσι ἐν τῇ προγεγραμμένῃ κώμη Βακχιάδει ἐν τῇ λεγομένῃ Βορρείτου λαύρᾳ, ὡν πάντων αἱ γειτωνείαι διὰ τῶν περὶ τούτων οἰκονομιῶν δηλοῦνται. καὶ ἔξ ἡς πεποίηνται πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐξευδωκούντων ἐκ κλήρου διαιρέσεως καὶ λελογ- 10 χέναι τὸν μὲν Ὄριωνα εἰς τὸ ἐπίβαλλον αὐτῷ μέρος τὸ προγεγραμμένον τέταρτον μέρος τῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ αὐτῶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀδιαιρετον. τὸν δὲ Ὄρον καὶ αὐτὸν λελογχέναι εἰς τῷ καὶ αὐτῷ ἐπίβαλλον μέρος τὸ προγεγραμμένον τέταρτον μέρος τῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ αὐτῶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀδιαιρετον, 15 ὡν ἐστειν αὐτοῦ Ὄρου τὸ ἄλλω τριακοστέκτον μέρος τῶν αὐτῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ αὐτοῦ Ὄρου καὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς προφέρωνται οἱ ἐνφερόμενοι, ἄλλο πατρει-

κὸν δωδέκατον μέρος τῶν αὐτῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ αὐτῶν, ὥστε
 τὸ ὅλον αὐτοῦ "Ωρου
 μόνου ὀκτωκαιδέκατον τετρακαιείκοστον μέρος τῶν αὐτῶν
 οἰκοπέδων καὶ
 αὐτῶν. ἐνμενέτωσαν οὖν οἱ ὁμολογοῦντος καὶ ἑκάτερος αὐτῶν
 καὶ οἱ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐν
 τοῖς κατὰ τή[ντε] τὴν διαιρεσιν ταύτην σημαινομένοις
 [πᾶσι] καὶ μηδὲ εἶναι αὐτοῖς
 20 μηδὲ τοῖς παρ' αὐτῶν ἀθετῆσαι τει τῶν [διε]ιρημένων, ἀλλὰ
 δὲ καὶ [ἔκαστον] αὐτῶν
 καὶ τοὺς παρ' αὐτῶν μεταλημψομένους κυρειεύειν καὶ δεσπό-
 ζειν ὡν [ἔκαστος
 αὐτῶν κεκλήρωται καθὼς πρόκιται, καὶ χρᾶσθαι ἔκαστον αὐ-
 τῶν καθ' ὅν ἐὰν
 βούλωνται τρόπον ἀπαραποδίστως. καὶ πρὸς τὰ προκίμενα
 καὶ διειρημένα
 πάντα, μηδένα αὐτῶν ἐνκαλεῖν μηδὲ ἐνκαλέσειν τῷ ἐτέρῳ μηδὲ
 ἐπελεύ-
 25 σεσθαι τρόπῳ μηδενεὶ παραορέσει μηδεμείᾳ. ὅτει δ' ἀν τῶν
 προγεγραμμένων πα-
 ραβῆ τεις τῶν ὁμολογούντων, ἀποτισάτω ⟨⟨ἀποτισάτωι⟩⟩ ὁ
 παραβὰς αὐτῶν τῷ ἐνμένων-
 τει παραχρῆμα τὰ βλάβη διπλᾶ καὶ ἐπίτειμον ἀργυρείου
 δραχμὰς τριακοσίας
 καὶ ἐς τὸ δημόσειον τὰς ἵσας καὶ μηδὲν ἡσσον μενόντων τῶν
 διομολογημένων καὶ
 διειρημένων πᾶν διὰ παντὸς κυρείων ἐπὶ τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον καθ'
 ὅτει καὶ ἐστειν.
 30 ὑπογραφεὺς τοῦ 'Ωρίωνος 'Ωρίων ὑειὸς ὡς ἐτῶν πεντήκοντα
 . . . εν., οὐλή μ[ε-
 τώπῳ ἔξδεξειῶν' τοῦ δ' ἄλλου 'Αμμώνιος Πτολεμαίου ὡς [ἐτῶν
 πεντήκοντα δύο, οὐλὴ μήλω δεξειῶ. ἡ διαιρεσις ἡδε κυρία
 ἔστω.
 . . .
 (2d hand.) 'Ωρίων 'Ωρίωνος τοῦ Μενχήους ὁμολογῶ ἀνενη-
 νηχέναι πρὸς
 "Ωρου "Ωρου τοῦ Πετεύρεος τὴν διαιρεσιν τον προγεγραμ-
 μένων ⟨⟨με-⟩⟩

35 μερῶν τῶν οἰκοπέδων καὶ κεκ[λήρω]μαι τὸ τέταρτον μέρος,
καὶ

οὐ Ωρος <κεκλήρωται> [τὸ] τρίτον τοῦ δωδεκάτου μέρους,
οὐ ἐστιν τριακοσέκτ-

μέρος ὃν ἐστιν αὐτοῦ ἄλλω τριακοσέκτου μέρος κ[αὶ
αὐ]τοῦ

καὶ τοῦ α<ν>τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ἄλλω δωδέκατον μέρος καὶ
εὐδο-

κ[ω π]ᾶσι τοῖς προκιμένοις. ἔγραψεν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Ὁρίων
νιὸς διὰ

40 τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτὸν γράμματα. (3d hand.) Ωρος Ωρου
τοῦ Πετεύριος [όμολ]ογῷ

συνανενεχέναι τὴν διαιρεσιν τῶν μερῶν <τῶν> οἰκοπέ-
δων καὶ κεκλήρωμαι τὸ τρίτον

τοῦ δωδεκάτου μέρους, οὐ ἐστιν τριακοσθέκτου μέρος, ὃν ἐστίν
μου ἄλλο

τριακοσθέκτου μέρος καὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου ἄλλο
πατρικὸν δωδέκατον

μέρος, καὶ εὐδοκῶ πᾶσι τοῖς προκιμένοις. ἔγραψεν ὑπὲρ
αὐτοῦ Ἀμμόνιος τοῦ Πτολεμαίου

45 μὴ ἴδοτος γράμματα. (1st hand.) ἔτους ζ αὐτοκράτορος
καίσαρος Οὐεσπασιανοῦ σεβαστοῦ μηνὸς

Καισαρείου ἐπαγ(ομένων) βῆ, ἀναγέγ(ραπται) διὰ τοῦ πρὸς
τῷ γρ(αφίω) Βακχίαδος καὶ Ὁφαιστίαδος.

4 διηρῆσθαι cf. ll. 20, 23. 6 The first hand of this papyrus regularly
uses ει for ε in forms of ειμι and τις. 18 δομολογοῦντες. 19 Cf. no. 99,
l. 20. 30 For ὑπογραφεῖς, see Pap. Tebt. II, 383, 45. 42-43 Elsewhere
τριακοστέκτου οὐ τριακοσέκτου (ll. 36-37).

The verso has the following notation: Ομ(ολογία) ἀλλή(λων) Ωρου καὶ
Ωρίωνος διαιρέσειν.

TRANSLATION

The seventh year of Imperator Caesar Vespasianus Augustus,
in the month Caesareus, the second of the supplementary days, at
Bacchias in the division of Heraclides of the Arsinoite nome.

Horion, son of Horion, son of Menches, about seventy years
old, with a scar in the middle of his forehead, and Horus, son of

Horus, son of Peturis, about forty-two years old, with a scar on the right wrist, both of them, acknowledge that they have divided between themselves from the present day for all time the portions which they have of building sites owned by their fathers, that is, what constitutes a fourth and a third of a twelfth, which is one thirty-sixth, of these sites, which are common and undivided in three sections in the aforesaid village Bacchias, in the lane called 'of Borrites'; the boundaries of all of which are set forth in the deeds relating to them.

And in accordance with the division by lot which they have made by agreement between themselves, Horion on the one hand has obtained as the share which falls to him the aforesaid common and undivided fourth part of the building sites; and on the other hand Horus himself has obtained as the share falling to him the aforesaid third of a twelfth, which is the common and undivided thirty-sixth part of the same building sites, of which same building sites Horus himself possesses another thirty-sixth part, and Horus himself and his brother, as the parties concerned declare, hold another twelfth part of the same building sites which belonged to their father, so that the total share of Horus himself alone is one eighteenth and one twenty-fourth of the same building sites.

Accordingly, let the contracting parties, each of the two and their heirs, observe all the terms which are set forth regarding this division. And neither may they nor their heirs set aside any part of the terms of division, but each of them and their assigns shall hold and control what each has obtained by lot, just as is set forth, and each of them shall make use thereof in whatsoever way they (he) may desire, without restriction.

And with respect to all the terms of division which have been set forth, let neither of them in the present or future accuse the other or proceed against him in any way upon any false pretext.

And if one of the contracting parties breaks any of the aforesaid terms, let the transgressor immediately pay to the one who abides by them double damages and a fine of three hundred drachmas in silver, and to the treasury an equal sum, the terms of agreement and division remaining none the less valid in every detail in perpetuity, just as they stand.

Signatory for Horion, Horion his son, about fifty . . . years

old, with a scar on the right side of his forehead, and for the other, Ammonius, son of Ptolemaeus, about fifty-two years old, with a scar on his right cheek.

Let this division be valid.

(*2d hand.*) I, Horion, son of Horion, son of Menches, acknowledge that I have made with Horus, son of Horus, son of Peteuris, the division of the aforesaid parts of the building sites. And I have received by lot the fourth, and Horus (has received by lot) the third of the twelfth, which is the thirty-sixth part, (of the properties) of which he himself possesses another thirty-sixth, and he and his brother another twelfth. And I agree to all the above terms. Horion his son wrote for him, because he is illiterate.

(*3d hand.*) I, Horus, son of Horus, son of Peteuris, acknowledge that I have made the division of the parts of the building sites. And I have obtained by lot the third of the twelfth, which is the thirty-sixth part, (of the properties) of which I possess another thirty-sixth part, and I and my brother another twelfth part from our father. And I agree to all the above terms. Ammonius, son of Ptolemaeus wrote for him, since he is illiterate.

(*1st hand.*) The seventh year of Imperator Caesar Vespasianus Augustus, in the month Caesareus, the second of the supplementary days. Registered through the clerk of the record office of Baccias and Hephaestias.

The dating of these documents presents no difficulty, for each of them bears in two places the year, month, and day upon which it was drawn up. In the case of the months, both the Egyptian and the Macedonian or Roman names are given. In translating the terms employed here into those of the modern calendar, it must be remembered that from the time of Augustus the Egyptian year began on Thoth 1, which corresponds to August 29 (every fourth year to August 30). This Egyptian year comprised twelve months of thirty days each, and an additional five days (*ai ἐπαγόμεναι*) added at the close of the twelfth month. In Egypt, the years of the rule of the *princeps* were equated with the local calendar year in such a manner that the second year of each principate began on the August 29 immediately following his assumption

of the *imperium* (Mitteis-Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, I, Introd. lv-lvi). Since Vespasian took the title *imperator* at Alexandria on July 1, 69 A.D., his second year was reckoned in Egypt from August 30 of the same calendar year, and his fourth year fell between August 29, 71 and August 29, 72. As the month Mecheir or Xandicus comprised the thirty days from January 26 to February 24, the 26th of this month would correspond to February 20. Accordingly the date of no. 9 is February 20, 72 A.D. Using the same method, we can date no. 98 on August 26, 75 A.D.

Although these two *homologiae* are unusually perfect examples of their particular type of *δημόσιοι χρηματισμοι*, I shall ignore their interest as legal documents and content myself with pointing out the relationship of one to the other.

In the first place, it will at once be clear that the two agreements were concluded between exactly the same parties, and further, that they have to do with the division of the same pieces of property, to wit, certain building sites inherited in joint ownership by the parties aforesaid and located in three sections in the village of Bacchias in the division of Heraclides in the Arsinoite nome. Furthermore, in each case the division is carried out in precisely the same manner. On each occasion two sections, the one equal to one fourth of the whole property and the other equal to one thirty-sixth of the same, were distributed by lot, and on each occasion the same party received the larger, and the same the smaller share.

However, the documents are not duplicates of the same contract. That possibility is precluded by the difference in date of the two contracts, a difference which is supported by the differences in the ages of the contracting parties and of Ammonius the representative of one of them. Nor have we to do with a second division necessitated by a failure to carry the first into effect. The two contracts record successive divisions of the same properties. The conclusive proof of this comes from a comparison of ll. 17-19 of no. 99 with ll. 14-18 of no. 98; and from ll. 37-38 and 43-44 of no. 98 which

have no parallels in no. 99. In ll. 17-19 of no. 99 it is stated that Horus and his brother are already in joint possession of one twelfth of these properties by inheritance. In ll. 14-18 of no. 98, however, it is said that Horus himself already has one thirty-sixth of his own, in addition to the one twelfth which he holds jointly with his brother, so that altogether he has one eighteenth, *i.e.*, this thirty-sixth plus the one which he receives by the division set forth in this deed, and one twenty-fourth, which is the half of what he holds jointly with his brother. This statement is borne out by ll. 37-38 and 43-44 of the declarations of the parties to the contract. The obvious conclusion is that the division agreed upon in the earlier document, no. 99, is that by which Horus received the one thirty-sixth referred to as being in his possession at the time of the second division agreed upon in no. 98, three years later.

It would be of interest to know why only certain fractions of the joint properties were divided upon each of these occasions, why these fractions were so unequal in size, and if there was any manipulation of the lot which gave Horion the larger share at each division. But the contracts themselves give us no clue to the answers to these questions. However, it is certainly a remarkable bit of chance which has brought together in the same collection in such a far distant part of the world two such intimately related papyrus documents.

VII.—*The Carrière of the Higher Roman Officials in Egypt
in the Second Century*

BY DR. SUSAN H. BALLOU

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

ESPECIAL interest attaches to the investigation of all questions that are concerned with the administration of ancient Egypt in the Roman period. This is partly due to the peculiar position of Egypt among the provinces of Rome, arising from the way in which it was acquired, as the special and private possession of Augustus, and to the way in which he chose to govern it, by preserving, according to his usual conservative policy, at least the outward forms of administration which had been employed by his predecessors, the Ptolemies. Interest is moreover very greatly enhanced by the recent widening of the field of research through the discovery and publication of the Egyptian papyri. The vast amount of first-hand source material which is thereby poured forth in almost bewildering profusion inevitably necessitates a complete revision of the earlier information drawn from literary and epigraphical sources and from the earlier-known papyri. There is no very recent treatment of the special phase of the administration of Egypt which forms the subject of the present paper.¹ In view of the great amount of new

¹ The basic books are still O. Hirschfeld's *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*², Berlin, 1905; Paul M. Meyer's list of the prefects of Egypt in *Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer*, Leipzig, 1900; and V. Martin's *Les Épistratèges*, Geneva, 1911. Besides these, the compendious little book of H. Mattingly, entitled *The Imperial Civil Service of Rome* (Cambridge, 1910) is very useful, but attempts no special treatment of the imperial government of Egypt (cf. p. 128). These have been supplemented by articles in *Hermes* and other journals, and in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*. In R. H. Lacey's *The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian: their Careers, with Notes on Hadrian's Reforms* (Princeton diss. 1917), discussion of individual officials supplies occasional information regarding posts in Egypt. No complete treatment of the Egyptian officials has been made for a decade, as far as the present writer can learn.

material now available, investigation is bound to be fertile in results, and a summarization of the information which can be obtained up to the present time is much to be desired.

This paper does not, however, attempt a complete treatment, but presents a few notes on the results of some preliminary research. By no means has the writer been able to cover all the papyrus material, as must in time be done. The present study has been limited to the second century, as being the period following upon the general administrative reforms of the Emperor Hadrian, in which the Egyptian offices became more regularized and defined. At the other end, it includes the reign of Septimius Severus, practical man of affairs, who was the second important factor, after Augustus, in the reorganization, especially on the financial side, of the imperial government. Here, if anywhere, one may expect to find the appointments to the administrative offices in Egypt following some formal scheme, which will permit the reconstruction of a definite *carrière* or *cursus honorum*.

It will be remembered that in the government of Egypt the highest official was not a procurator, as in the other Roman provinces, but a governor appointed by the emperor to be his viceroy, and therefore to hold the same relation to the rest of the administrative machinery that the Ptolemaic kings had had. He bore the title of Prefect of Egypt, or more fully, he was *praefectus Alexandreae et Aegypti*, for he had his seat at the capital city. In the Greek inscriptions he appears as *ἐπαρχος Αἰγύπτου*, but in the papyri usually as *ἡγεμων*. This highest official was regularly a Roman. The single certain exception known is Ti. Julius Alexander, chief of staff of Titus at the capture of Jerusalem, who was a native Egyptian. Very early Augustus, after experimenting at first with freedmen, bestowed the office, not upon men of senatorial rank, but upon Roman knights.

The officials next in rank under the *praefectus* were, on the legal side, the *iuridicus* (in Greek *δικαιοδότης*), and in the financial administration the *idiologus* (*ἴδιος λόγος*), the

latter a title retained from Ptolemaic times. These officials, while under the prefect, were directly connected with the emperor himself, and could only be removed by him. It is not within the present purpose to go into the matter of a precise definition of their jurisdiction and duties. The point of interest at this time is that the Roman knights were appointed to these offices also. On the other hand, the under-officials, employed in the bureau of the *idiologus*, called *procuratores usiaci* (in Greek ἐπίτροποι τῶν οὐσιακῶν), were regularly freedmen, at least down to the time of Septimius Severus, who for a time put Roman knights into these subordinate places also.

Over each of the three great administrative divisions of Egypt an *epistrategus* was in charge.² This title was retained from the Ptolemaic government, but the office itself was stripped of all its previous military significance, and was purely administrative and financial under the Romans. The *epistrategi* also were regularly Roman knights. Their subordinates, the *στρατηγοί*, placed each in charge of a separate territorial subdivision or district, were not Romans but Greeks or Greco-Egyptians, as their names indicate. They, as also the subordinates of the *idiologus*, were separated by a wide gap from the upper officials. Therefore their positions cannot be regarded as forming steps in a *cursus honorum*, leading to the superior posts of the Roman knights. There were then no offices in Egypt itself, below the rank of *idiologus*, *iuridicus*, or *epistrategus*, from which a Roman knight could rise to the higher grades. To the question whether an *idiologus*, a *iuridicus*, or an *epistrategus* could rise to be *praefectus* in Egypt we will return later.

In regard to the prefecture, the more recent publications

² The whole province of Egypt was divided into three great governmental units, the Thebaid, the Delta, and the division comprising the Seven Nomes and the Arsinoëte Nome, known as *epistrategiae Septem Nomorum et Arsinoïtae*. It is in this last territorial division that the largest finds of papyri have been made, so that the great body of our information is directly or indirectly concerned with this middle region of Egypt.

of the papyri not only confirm in many cases the names already known of prefects of the second century, but also furnish us with certain corrections in our list, as well as a number of new names. These additional names are significant, since they fill some gaps and remove some uncertainties previously existing. This is also especially true for the third and fourth centuries, concerning which Meyer, whose list is used throughout this discussion as a basis (see note 1), had but scanty information. The following instances will serve to illustrate the changes which even incomplete investigation renders necessary at certain points.

In Meyer's list of the prefects of Egypt, after the name of C. Pomponius Planta with a term covering the years 96-99, a period of five years is without incumbent; then follow C. Vibius Maximus, 104, and C. Minicius Itala, 105. The date of the former is certain, being obtained from an inscription on the right foot of the Memnon (*C.I.L. III*, 38), declaring that he as *praefectus Aegypti* heard its voice in the seventh year of the Emperor Trajan. The date 105 for Minicius Itala rests upon an inscription set up to him in Aquileia in that year, and giving what was doubtless his whole *cursus honorum* at that time, ending with *praefectus Aegypti*. It is however not necessary to assume that he held that office in 105 — indeed the probability is that he did not, since the stone is not Egyptian. We now learn from *Pap. Oxyr. VII*, 1022 that he was *praefectus* in February, 103. His term must therefore be placed before that of Vibius Maximus instead of after it. The editor of this document cites also, in confirmation of the new date for Minicius Itala, *Pap. Amh.* 64 and "the correct reading of *B.G.U.* 908, 9 in *Arch. f. Pap. II*, 137." The reconstructed list at this point should now read: C. Pomponius Planta, 96-99; C. Minicius Itala, 103; C. Vibius Maximus, 103-104.

The term of Q. Rhamnus Martialis, who was formerly assigned to the year 118 on the basis of two Greek inscriptions, should now be extended in both directions. *Pap. Oxyr. VII*,

1023, 6-8 takes him back to the first year of Hadrian's reign, while *Pap. Oxyr.* XII, 1547, 4 shows him to have been still in office in 119. It seems not improbable that he had no successor before Haterius Nepos, the beginning and end of whose term, 121-124, have been ascertained respectively from a Latin inscription (*C.I.L.* XI, 5213) and from *Pap. Rain.* 1492.

There follow in Meyer's list T. Flavius Titianus, 126-131, and Sex. Petronius Mamertinus, 134-138. *Pap. Ryl.* 113 furnishes information which lessens the vacant years between their two terms and renders an intervening incumbent very unlikely. We may now read: T. Flavius Titianus, 126-132, and Mamertinus, 133-138. In *Pap. Ryl.* 74, 1 the praenomen of the latter seems certainly [Μάρ]κος, and not Sextus.³

The prefecture of M. Sempronius Liberalis was assigned by Meyer to the years 154-156, on the basis of two Berlin papyri, which assure for him the years 154 and 155. Thinking that he alone could have been the Αὐγυστάλιος ἔπαρχος who was killed in an uprising in Egypt while the Emperor Antoninus Pius was in that country, Meyer reckons the date of the death of Sempronius Liberalis as 156.⁴ And in the following years, about which he felt some doubt, he listed Valerius Eudae-mon, 157/158; L. Volusius Maecianus, 159-161; and Postumus, 161. Following these comes M. Annius Syriacus, 162/163. New light now comes from recently published papyri. *Pap. Oxyr.* VII, 1032 shows Sempronius Liberalis to have been prefect still in the 20th year of Antoninus Pius, *i.e.* 156/157. In *Pap. Ryl.* 78, to be dated in 157, the same man is ἡγεμών; and *Pap. Ryl.* 271 refers to a Sempronius Liberalis who was prefect in the 23rd year of Antoninus, *i.e.* 159/160. According to these data, the term of Liberalis must have covered the years from 154 to 159. The name of Valerius Eudaemon, which had been listed for 157/158, must be shifted to an earlier date, as appears from *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 899, 29, which

³ As it appears in *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, III, 212, and in Meyer's list.

⁴ *Herm.* XXXII (1897), 224-225.

mentions a decision rendered by him while prefect in one of the earlier years of Antoninus Pius.⁵ And the supposed prefecture of Postumus in 161 may be finally dismissed, as the editor of *Pap. Oxyr.* III, 653 remarks; and he continues: "the prefecture of L. Volusius Maecianus may occupy the whole period between the prefectures of M. Sempronius Liberalis and M. Annus Syriacus."⁶ The revised list is as follows: M. Sempronius Liberalis, 154-159; L. Volusius Maecianus, 159-162; M. Annus Syriacus, 162-163.

Two new names, not previously known from any other source, are now obtained. Flavius Sulpicius Similis, according to *Pap. Oxyr.* II, 237, col. 8, 21, was *ἐπαρχος Αἰγυπτον* in Nov., 182. The same name occurs in *Pap. Oxyr.* IV, 712, 22, a document in bad condition but probably of Commodus' reign. From another Oxyrhynchus papyrus, II, 237, we get the name of Pomponius Faustianus as prefect in the 26th year of Commodus. The names previously listed at this place are Flavius Priscus, 181; P. Maenius Flavianus, 182/183; Longaeus Rufus, 184/185. The name of Flavius Priscus rests upon a restoration; the correct name of Flavianus is uncertain.⁷ Both will now have to be removed, for the new information leads to the conclusion that Sulpicius Similis preceded Longaeus Rufus, while Faustianus must have succeeded him sometime between September, 185 and January, 186. The list then reads: Flavius Sulpicius Similis, 182; Longaeus Rufus, 184-185; Pomponius Faustianus, 185/186.

Another new name, that of Larcius Memor, for the year 192, is added by *Pap. Ryl.* 77, 38, and must come between M. Aurelius Papirius Dionysius, who is listed "vor 189", and L. Mantennius Sabinus, whose exact term is also in doubt.

A previously unknown prefect of the name of Magnus Felix Crescentillianus appears in *Pap. Oxyr.* IX, 1185. The

⁵ The editor reads the 5th year, but the numeral is uncertain.

⁶ The prefecture of Maecianus has been the subject of much debate; see *Herm.* XXXIII (1898), 262 f.

⁷ Cf. *Pros. Imp. Rom.* II, 321. Note the confusion possible through the similarity in the names Flavius Priscus, Flavius Similis, Maenius Flavianus.

papyrus bears no date, but since it was accompanied by a document of the reign of Severus, the editor thinks it of that period, and is inclined to place the new man in the gap which occurs in the list between 197 and 201. But new information concerning the prefect formerly known for 197, namely Aemilius Saturninus, makes it necessary to defer placing Crescentillianus till more certain data concerning him are available. The position of Saturninus in the list has depended upon *B.G.U.* 15, which is a letter addressed to the *strategi septem nomorum*, without designation of the title of the official issuing it. The *Prosopographia* suggests he was *epistrategus*, and is inclined to identify him with the Aemilius Saturninus who was *praefectus praetorio* in 200 (Dio, LXXV, 14, 2). Meyer argues that he could not have been *epistrategus* in 197 and pretorian prefect in 200, the interval between the two offices being too brief. New information from *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 916, 10, puts his status beyond question. For in this document Saturninus is *ῆγεμῶν* in the sixth year of Severus, *i.e.* 198/199. Furthermore *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 899 shows the same man to have been prefect in the seventh year of an emperor whose name is not given, but who must be Severus. It is clear that Saturninus was still prefect by June, 199, so that we now have for him a term of at least three years, 197-199.

The next prefect on the list is Q. Maecius Laetus,⁸ assigned to 201; then follows Subatianus Aquila with the term 201-207. *Pap. Oxyr.* XII, 1548, 5 makes it certain that Laetus remained in office to September, 202, probably continuing into 203. The term of Subatianus could not, then, have begun until that time.⁹ Maecius Laetus we know was pretorian prefect in 205. Considering the customary close succession of this office upon that of *praefectus Aegypti*,¹⁰ it is probable that Laetus retained the latter position till 204. This would not unduly

⁸ Cf. the editor's note on *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 899, 10.

⁹ See note on *Pap. Oxyr.* VIII, 1111, col. 1, 3.

¹⁰ See below, pp. 104 f.

shorten the term of Subatianus Aquila as pretorian prefect, in which office, it would seem from *Pap. Flor.* 6, he continued at least down to July 23, 210.

The considerable vacancy which next occurs in Meyer's list we can now at least partially fill. *Pap. Oxyr.* XII, 1408 furnishes the name of L. Baebius Aurelius Iuncinus, also known from *Pap. Giess.* 40, col. 2, 14 to have been in office on Jan. 29, 213. Septimius Heraclitus, who entered upon his office March 16, 215 (*B.G.U.* 362, col. 7, 8), was probably his immediate successor. Baebius may very well have had a term of five years, 210-215. The discovery of his Egyptian prefecture is interesting in view of the fact that we have had his previous career in a Latin inscription (*C.I.L.* x, 7580), but did not know that he attained the highest Egyptian office. Our reconstructed list at this point now reads: Aemilius Saturninus, 197-199/200; Maecius Laetus, 201-204; Subatianus Aquila, 204-210; L. Baebius Aurelius Juncinus, 210-214.

While still far from complete, the rearrangements and corrections thus far made in the list of prefects lead to certain interesting conclusions. Some previously uncertain incumbents of the office, whose position on the list has rested upon the conjectured restoration of inscriptions or of documents on papyrus, may now be eliminated. Others, for whom the dates were conjectural, may be shifted to other positions, to be determined as our information increases. In some cases, the term of office is considerably extended by the more recent data. The general tendency of these changes is toward a greater average length of tenure than used to appear. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* 348, remarks that the office of the prefect had no fixed term, and gives as example of a very long tenure that of the uncle of Seneca, which lasted 16 years. He states also that terms of 5-6 years are attested. The case of Seneca's uncle, Vitrarius Pollio, occurs in the middle of the not yet regularized first century. For the second century the term of 5-6 years may prove to be the rule rather than the exception. Certainly the reconstructed list for the reigns

of Hadrian and his immediate successor approaches such uniformity. This list is as follows:

- 117-121, Q. Rhamnus Martialis
- 121-126, T. Haterius Nepos
- 126-132, T. Flavius Titianus
- 133-138, M. Petronius Mamertinus
- 138-144, C. Avidius Heliodorus.

Three names concerning which there is some uncertainty as to tenure follow. Then come other consistent examples:

- 154-159, M. Sempronius Liberalis
- 159-162, L. Volusius Maecianus.

The reconstructed list also furnishes more exact information concerning the relation which the office of *praefectus praetorio* bore to that of *praefectus Aegypti*. It has long been known from the inscriptions that the prefecture of the pretorian guard at Rome was the highest of the knight's offices, and that it was held after the Egyptian prefecture.¹¹ Of the eight cases of this succession of offices which the writer has been able to find between the year 95 and the end of the reign of Septimius Severus, there are five for which the exact dates of both offices are available. In all of these datable cases, there was no interval of time between the two offices, as appears in the following table:

- T. Petronius Secundus, prefect of Egypt in 95, pretorian prefect in 96
- M. Petronius Mamertinus, prefect of Egypt, 133-138, pretorian prefect, 139-143
- M. Bassaeus Rufus, prefect of Egypt, 166-168, pretorian prefect, 168-177
- Aemilius Saturninus, prefect of Egypt, 197-199, pretorian prefect, 200 (killed in that year).

The fifth case is that of C. Calvisius Statianus, who was prefect of Egypt from probably 171 to 175, when the revolution

¹¹ Cf. Mattingly, *op. cit.* 92 f.

of Avidius Cassius broke out. Sympathizing with that rebel, Calvisius was designated by him pretorian prefect. Naturally he never attained that office, but it is clear that it was deemed to be in regular and immediate succession to the prefecture of Egypt. In other cases the offices were held in this succession but the dates are not certainly known. For example, C. Sulpicius Similis, prefect of Egypt in 106-109, was pretorian prefect under Trajan, and was given a successor by Hadrian in 117. If he became pretorian prefect as early as 110, it would not have given him an unduly long term. The case of Maecius Laetus has already been mentioned.

These were the two offices in which the career open to the Roman knights culminated.¹² The preliminary offices in which the knight gained his preparation in civil service for the highest positions are now to be considered, and we return to the question whether the positions of secondary grade in Egypt were among these.

The introductory stages are well known from the inscriptions. The young knight held certain minor military offices in the Roman army,¹³ and from these advanced to his civil service, which regularly included the procuratorship of some province or provinces other than Egypt. Usually more than one of these were held. The office of *praefectus annonae*¹⁴ at

¹² Instances are known of knights who, after a long and full career of offices, were honored with the consular insignia or were even actually made consul. Maecius Laetus was *consul iterum*, probably so called from having received the consular insignia during his pretorian prefecture. T. Pactumeius Magnus, *praefectus Aegypti* in 177-180, was *consul suffectus* in 183. And C. Fulvius Plautianus, after being *praefectus praetorio* in 197, was *ornamentis consularibus honoratus*, then *in senatum adlectus*, and in 203 *consul ordinarius, dictus cos. II.* The *cursus* of M. Bassaeus Rufus (given by Mattingly, *op. cit.* 94) is remarkably full and interesting, since he rose from the rank of noncommissioned officer to the rank of knight, and then fulfilled its utmost possibilities. He received among a long list of special honors that of the consular insignia.

¹³ Examples may be studied, selected by Mattingly, *op. cit.* 94 f. For the occasional omission of the preliminary military offices in the case of knights holding responsible posts under the Emperor Hadrian, see Lacey, *op. cit.* 38 f.

¹⁴ The activities of this official seem to have been chiefly confined to the city, and consisted in providing the capital with a supply of grain, oil, and other

Rome seems to have been bestowed next before the Egyptian pretorship, at least after the early years of the Empire. In the *cursus* of Roman knights which are obtainable from the inscriptions from the time of the Flavian emperors to that of Septimius Severus, there appear eight cases of prefects of Egypt who held the two offices in this order. The exact dates of both offices are known for only two of these cases. In one there was an interval of three years, but this was still in the first century. In the other there was no interval between the two offices.¹⁵ The position of *praefectus vigilum* of the city of Rome also stood high in the *cursus* of the knight, being held apparently just before the prefecture of the grain-supply.¹⁶ This succession occurs in one of the two instances of the office known to the writer. In the other, the man was *praefectus vigilum* just before being Egyptian prefect, and the office of *praefectus annonae* was not held.

It is not necessary to enumerate here the various offices, below these in scale, which are known to have been open to Roman knights. Among them the positions of secondary rank in Egypt seem to have no regular place. It becomes interesting then, in connection with our subject, to find out whether the *idiologus*, the *iuridicus*, and the *epistrategus* ever rose to be prefect of Egypt. For the *epistrategus*, a comparison of Martin's list of the *epistrategi* with Meyer's list of the *praefecti* shows but a single instance of the same man holding both offices. This is Ti. Julius Alexander, *epistrategus* of the Thebaid in 42 and *praefectus Aegypti* in 67-69. His case, in

foods, in managing the funds, and supervising the sea-captains and the bakers (Mattingly, *op. cit.* 91).

¹⁵ The dated cases are: L. Laberius Maximus, *praef. ann.* 80, *praef. Aeg.* 83; and Valerius Proculus, *praef. ann.* 144, *praef. Aeg.* 145-147. The others are C. Tettius Africanus, *praef. Aeg.* 82; C. Minicius Itala, *praef. Aeg.* 103; C. Sulpicius Similis, *praef. Aeg.* 106-109; M. Petronius Honoratus, *praef. Aeg.* 148; M. Bassaeus Rufus, *praef. Aeg.* 166-168. M. Papirius Dionysius, *praef. Aeg.* 188, was reduced by Commodus to the office of *praefectus annonae* again, and died in 189.

¹⁶ So Mattingly, *op. cit.* 91, who describes the duties of this post as judicial and administrative as well as military.

other respects exceptional,¹⁷ falls in the first century. In the *cursus* of knights that are known, no other example occurs of an *epistrategus* becoming *praefectus*. And yet here and there in discussions concerning the identification of various prefects, this succession seems to be assumed as a natural one.¹⁸

For the period we are considering, there are two *epistrategi* on Martin's list, both of the Heptanomis, whose careers have come down to us. One of these, C. Camurius Clemens, held the office in Trajan's reign, the other, Ti. Claudius Xenophon, in that of Commodus, so that by chance evidence comes from the two extremes of our period only. In the *cursus* of Clemens, the preliminary military offices of the Roman knight, preceding his civil service, appear in the order in which they were regularly held (see Mattingly, *op. cit.* 65 f.). The *cursus* of Xenophon lacks them, whether or not he ever held them (cf. Lacey, *op. cit.* 38 f.). After these preliminary offices, Clemens held the procuratorship of one of the less important provinces, and then became *epistrategus* of the Seven Nomes and the Arsinoëte Nome. The *cursus* of Xenophon (whose name occurs also in *Pap. Oxyr.* IV, 718 and again in an unpublished Cornell papyrus), is more interesting. He was procurator successively of three of the more important provinces, and then was *procurator in Aegypto ad epistrategiam septem nomorum et Arsinoitum (sic)*. Later he held the post of *procurator viarum urbis* — at Rome of course. In no respect do the careers of these men differ from those of *praefecti*, as far as concerns the preliminary offices. And yet following these, they became *epistrategus* instead of *praefectus* in Egypt.

As for the *iuridicus*, he was the official to whom naturally the charge of the administration was committed in the ab-

¹⁷ See above, p. 87.

¹⁸ E. g. see *Herm.* XXXII, 483, n. 1, where Meyer objects to the identification of certain men as having been both *epistrategus* and *praefectus* on the ground that the interval between the two offices in each of the two cases under discussion would be too short. He instances the *cursus* of Julius Alexander as showing a more normal interval, one of 16 years. He does not quarrel with the idea that an *epistrategus* should become *praefectus*.

sence or lack of the *praefectus*. There is a special Greek phrase in the papyri for such a vice-prefect: he was *διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*. The *iuridicus* C. Caecilius Salvianus, who was thus provisionally entrusted with the official functions of the prefect, is called ὁ *κράτιστος δικαιοδότης καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*, (*B.G.U.* 327, of date 176).¹⁹ But only one instance is known to the writer of the *iuridicus* really rising to the prefecture. It is that of C. Caecina Tuscus, who held the lower office in 51/52 and was not prefect until 65/66. But again this case comes in the not yet regulated period of the first century. A *iuridicus*, L. Volusius Maecianus, who was in office at the time of the rebellion of Avidius Cassius and espoused that cause, was put in charge of the administration of Egypt by the rebel, and in a Berlin papyrus (613, 9) has the title of *επαρχος*. But this was a case of especial exigency, and the high office was a temporary one: Volusius was killed along with his master by the soldiers of Marcus (*Vita Marci*, 25, 4 and *Vita Avid. Cass.* 7, 4).²⁰ There are, so far as now known, no normal instances in our period of the *iuridicus* becoming *praefectus*.

Comparison of the earlier positions held by the incumbents of this office with those held by the prefects and the *epistrategi* brings out noticeable differences. The careers of three *iuridici* are available, namely, L. Volusius Clemens under Tiberius, L. Baebius Iuncinus in 137-138, and his successor, Sex. Cornelius Dexter.²¹ All three held the usual introductory military positions of the young knights, which were in each case followed by one civil charge preceding the Egyptian office. What that was in the case of Volusius we do not know, but a vacant place was left for it in his inscription. He died in Aquitania while on his way to Egypt, which may account

¹⁹ A. Klein, "Die Stellvertretung im Oberkommando von Aegypten," *Arch. f. Pap.* IV, 148 ff.

²⁰ This is of course not the Volusius Maecianus who was prefect of Egypt in 159-162; see above, p. 101, and cf. Stein, "Die Iuridici Alexandreae," *Arch. f. Pap.* I, 445 f.

²¹ See Stein, *op. cit.*

for the unfinished condition of the stone. Baebius was *praefectus vehicularum* under Hadrian, who had reorganized the administration of the imperial post and transferred it from the *liberti* to the knights.²² Cornelius Dexter held the office at Alexandria of *procurator Neaspoleos et mausolei* before being *iuridicus*, and afterwards was *procurator Asiae*. This kind of preliminary office is very different from the posts of responsibility which prepared the *praefectus* — and also the *epistrategus* — for their administrative duties. It appears that the differentiation began in the early stages of the civil service.

For the position of the *idiologus*, unfortunately, only one complete *cursus* is available that is certainly reliable. It is that of M. Aquilius Felix, who was *procurator idiologu* in 201. Here differentiation in the early career of civil service is again plain. After the early military offices (especially interesting, since he rose from centurion to the knight's census and career), he did not receive a provincial procuratorship, but held offices of no high rank at Rome. He was *procurator hereditatium patrimonii priuati*, i.e. he was engaged in the administration of the inheritances bequeathed to the emperor, a very modest office which was regarded as merely a branch of the *patrimonium* (Mattingly, *op. cit.* 81.). He was *procurator patrimonii bis*. This office, which was lower in rank in the second century than in the first, fell still lower in the time of Septimius Severus, to which this man belongs. He was then *praefectus classis praetorii Ravennetis*, the naval offices being the lowest of the equestrian *praefecturae*. The last office in this long list, which must have preceded his office in Egypt, was *ad census* (in the inscription written *a census*) *equitum Romanorum*.²³

²² A second instance of a *iuridicus* who had previously held the office of *praefectus vehicularum* is to be found in Ulbius Graianus, who held the former office in the eighth year of Marcus and Verus, i.e. 167/168, if the identity of these two officials can be established (cf. *Herm.* XXXII, 226, n. 2).

²³ Mattingly (*op. cit.* 53, n. 3) thinks this a different office from the *a censibus*, whose chief business was the enrollment of Roman knights, but is unable to reach any certain conclusion in the light of the evidence he has.

Here, as in the case of the *iuridici*, the type of career seems not to be such as would naturally lead to the highest administrative office in Egypt.²⁴ Was the difference in the training intentional on the part of the emperor, in order to keep the secondary officials more immediately dependent upon himself, and prevent them from aspiring to the supreme post? If this is true for the *iuridicus* and the *idiologus*, the question still remains why the *epistrategus*, who had just the same kind of training as the *praefectus*, did not in some cases succeed to the higher office. Further investigation may bring the solution of this problem.

²⁴ If the identification of the Eudaemon who appears as *procurator idiologu* in 142 in *Pap. Cattaoui* (see Meyer, *Herm.* xxxii 230, n. 3) with the Eudaemon mentioned in *Vita Hadr.* 15 is correct, the matter of the preliminary cursus of the *idiologus* is not so simple. He held the following list of good positions (*Pros. Imp. Rom.* II, 41): *procurator Hadriani ad diocesin Alexandriae*, *procurator bibliothecarum Graecarum et Latinarum*, *ab epistulis Graecis*, *procurator Lyciae Pamphyliae Galatiae Paphlagoniae Pisidiae Ponti*, *procurator hereditatium et procurator provinciae Asiae*, *procurator Syriae*.

VIII. — *A Papyrus Describing Magical Powers*

BY PROFESSOR CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

AMONG the Fayum papyri acquired by the University of Michigan in 1920 there is a small piece, numbered 5 in the inventory, which attracted attention at once because of the peculiar character of its contents. No value can be assigned to it on grounds of literary merit; but the question of its relations to previously known literature proved to be a matter of some interest.

The papyrus is written on one side only, and is evidently a single page from a roll. Its present size is about 16.2 cm. by 8.5 cm. A considerable upper margin is preserved. The lower has been broken away, probably taking with it some lines of writing. Twenty-two lines are well preserved, the twenty-third is broken in the middle, and of the twenty-fourth only a few letters are intact. The page has been broken longitudinally into two nearly equal parts, and some letters, mostly easily supplied, have been lost along the line of fracture. There is a margin at the right, so that the ends of the lines are preserved. The margin at the left is gone, but the beginnings of the lines are only slightly encroached upon, from line 19 down. The surface of the papyrus is somewhat eroded, but the reading is not often rendered doubtful for that reason.

The hand is a small semi-uncial, not particularly well-formed, but clear enough in the main. Some ligatures occur. The approach to the cursive is most notable in *χρήσασθαι* at the end of l. 17, and *σον* in l. 18. Mr. Hunt, of the British Museum, who gave it a cursory examination, thought that the writing was of the second or the third century of our era. Various minor indications lead me to think that the earlier date is to be preferred.

The text follows :

στήσεται κάν σελήνη κε
λεύσω καταβήσεται κάν
κυλῶσαι θελ[ή]σω τὴν ἡμέ
ραν ἡ νύξ μοι μένει κάν
δεηθῶμεν πάλιν ἡμέ
ρας τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἀπελεύσε
ται κάν πλεῦσαι θελήσω
τὴν θάλατταν οὐ δέομαι
νεώς κάν δι' ἀέρος ἐλθεῖν
κουφισθήσομ[α]ι ἐρωτικὸν
μόνον οὐχ εύρισκω φάρ
μακον οὐ ποιῆσαι δυνάμε
νον οὐ παῦσαι δυνάμενον
ἡ γῆ γὰρ φοβουμένη τὸν
θεὸν οὐ φέρει εἰ δέ τις ἔχει
καὶ δίδωσι λερω δέομαι
δότε πιεῖν θέλω χρήσασθαι
θέλω φαίνεσθαι σου τῇ θυ
γατρὶ καλὸν εἴδωλον λέ
γεις καὶ τοῦτο σ[ο]ι παράδο
ξον εἶναι δοκεῖ πόσοι δὲ
ἄλλοι παρ' ἀλόγων ρα . . η
]ν σωμάτων [. .]νι . . ο
] . . ερω[. .] μ[

Dots under letters indicate that they are broken or indistinct; dots under vacant spaces indicate that a corresponding number of letters has been lost leaving no satisfactory traces. Letters in brackets have been lost leaving virtually no traces, but are easily restored from the context. At the bottom of the page brackets roughly indicate the outlines of the laceration.

There are no accents in the papyrus, and in the single case where it could have been used (l. 18) iota adscript does not appear. Spaces have been used in the text above merely for the reader's convenience; such slight divisions as occur between the words in the papyrus have no relation to the sense of the clauses.

Two errors in the text should be mentioned. In l. 1, *σελήνη* should be *σελήνην*, an error of a kind common in papyri of this period. In l. 3, *κυλῶσαι* should apparently be *κωλῦσαι*, though if *κωλῦσαι* be right we have here a use of the verb which is not easily paralleled. A correspondent's suggestion *κολοῦσαι* will probably occur to others; and it is true that the two words are confused in manuscripts of later centuries, as Wytttenbach showed in a note on Plutarch's *Moralia*, 69 E (*Animadv.* vi, 524). But on the whole it seems more likely that *κωλῦσαι τὴν ἡμέραν*, 'hinder the day', that is, hinder the coming of the day, may be regarded as a fairly natural, though uncommon, development -- 'hinder, impede' becoming 'retard, defer.' Besides, *κολοῦσαι* would be more appropriate where the context called for the notion of hastening the end of the day rather than that of delaying its beginning. Peculiar also is *οὐ ποιῆσαι δυνάμενον οὐ παῦσαι δυνάμενον* (l. 12 f), where *οὐτε* — *οὐτε* might be expected; but the text is certain.

In l. 16, before *δέομαι*, a word is uncertain. It ended in *ω*, before which went a letter that projected below the line. There are three such in this papyrus — *ι*, *ρ*, *φ*. Before this downward projecting letter is a fairly clear portion of an *ε* (the letter was almost certainly rounded, so *ι* is unlikely); then traces which correspond best to *λ*, (though *δ* is possible, *α* less likely), and before that again a space sufficient for one or two letters, in which no traces of ink are now visible. There are slight depressions in the surface of the papyrus, but it is very doubtful whether they correspond to the ductus litterarum. Possibly *ἀλλ' ἐρῶ* is the reading, in which case *ἐρῶ* is parenthetical and *ἀλλ'* is to be taken with the request

or command, as in Tyrtaeus, 10, 15, *ῳ νέοι, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθε*, Plato, *Phaedr.* 228 D, *ἀλλ’ ἵθι, δείκνυε*; *Phaedo*, 117 A, *ἀλλ’ ἵθι, ἔφη, πείθου κτλ.*; *Rep.* 327 B, *ἀλλὰ περιμένετε*, and many other places. But in any case *ἀλλ’* must remain dubious; and if it is right the first two letters must have been slightly crowded.

In l. 19 one is inclined at first reading to take *καλὸν εἴδωλον* with the foregoing *φαίνεσθαι*; but in view of the following clause this seems impossible. *καλὸν εἴδωλον* begins a new sentence, I think, the two words being in direct quotation with *λέγεις*. In l. 22 the text has *παραλογῶν* without division. I read it as two words in the belief that *παρ’ ἀλόγων σωμάτων* went as an expression of source or agency with an aorist passive standing between the last two words. *ἡράσθησαν* would suit the space and the remaining letters, and, for the sense, one might refer to such a situation as occurs in Lucian's *Asinus*; but in view of the lack of clear connection with the foregoing sentences it seems better not to incumber the text with an uncertain restoration.

We may now translate: . . . ‘it will stand still (*sc.* the sun); and if I command the moon, it will come down; and if I wish to delay the day, the night stays for me; and if again we need the day, the light will not go away. And if I wish to sail the sea, I do not need a ship; and if I wish to go through the air, I shall be made light. A love charm alone I do not find, either one able to cause love or one able to allay it; for the earth, fearing the god, does not produce it. But if anybody has it and gives it, I shall say “I beg you give it me to drink; I wish to use it — I wish that it appear to thy daughter.” “A pretty phantasy,” you say, and this seems to you an unheard-of thing; but how many others from (or by) brute bodies’ . . .

The phrase *φαίνεσθαι σον τῷ θυγατρὶ* causes some difficulty. There is nothing strange in the circumstance that the magically-skilled speaker is a woman; but why does she refer to herself as “thy daughter”? It may be that in ap-

pealing to the unknown holder of the love charm which she herself can not find, she uses the language of an apprentice to a master or mistress. But both Dieterich (*Eine Mithras-liturgie*, 52, 146 ff., 151) and Reitzenstein (*Hellenist. Mysterienreligionen*, 27, 105) have shown that the word 'father' is used in the mystery religions of a teacher or adept in relation to a novice; and this analogy is probably most in point. In a Berlin magical papyrus¹ there is a passage which directs that a particularly powerful charm be revealed only to the operator's own son — as if to the exclusion of an apprentice or son according to the mystic craft.

Unquestionably the speaker in our papyrus is describing magical powers in the opening sentences. But this is certainly not a magical papyrus in the technical sense, as the phrase is used, for example, to describe the great magical books of the British Museum, or of Berlin, Paris, and Leyden. Those papyri consist in the main of charms and invocations to secure the help of gods or daemons, and of miscellaneous recipes — the last usually expressed by the second person imperatives and futures. Passages in the first person occur chiefly when the operator identifies himself mystically with the god in order to compel lesser daemons to do his will.

There are, to be sure, some close verbal correspondences between the first lines of this papyrus and certain passages in the magical books above mentioned. So in the Berlin magical papyrus mentioned above (l. 117 ff.)² there is the following description of the powers with which the *δαίμων πάρεδρος*, or familiar spirit, can endow the operator who controls him: "He changes you into the form of any animal that you wish. . . . He will lift you into the air and again cast you into the billows of the sea currents. . . . He will quickly freeze the rivers and the sea so that you can run upon them as many furlongs as you will . . . (a gap in the text follows, then an

¹ The first of the two papyri published in *Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1865; see p. 125, l. 193.

² *Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1865, p. 123.

imperfect sentence, then the clause) when you wish to draw down the stars."

So also in the great magical papyrus of Paris³ the operator is instructed thus: "Draw breath from the rays, inhaling three times, as deeply as you can, and you will see yourself lifted up (*ἀνακουφιζόμενον*) and passing over into the upper regions so that you think that you are in the midst of the air. . . ."

Again, in the Leyden papyrus I there is a sort of chanted prelude (*ἀρχή*) beginning "Open are the gates of heaven, open are the gates of the earth, open is the road of the sea, open is the road of the rivers."⁴ In both of the Leyden papyri there is mention of a sacred name which will cause rivers or the sea to be frozen or to turn to stone.⁵ One of these passages, from *Pap. Leid. J*, has another phrase (*οὐ ηλιος στήσεται*) which recalls the language of our papyrus. In J again there is a charm in which the operator is directed to say, as in the person of a divinity, "I am he who hath his abiding-place in the heaven and goeth to and fro in water and fire and earth and air."⁶

There are also literary texts which show that powers of the sort described in our papyrus were the regular stock in trade of the magician. In Lucian's *Philopseudes*, 13 the credulous Cleodemus claims to have seen a magician from the land of the Hyperboreans fly through the air, walk on water and through fire, call up the dead, draw down the moon from heaven, and work effective love charms. Flying is mentioned also in *Asinus*, 4.

Perhaps if both form and substance be considered, the closest parallel to the opening lines of the papyrus is to be found in the pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones*, II, 9, where

³ Lines 537 ff. (Wessely in *Denkschr. Wien. Akad.* 1888, p. 58). The text given here is that of Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 6.

⁴ *Pap. Leid. I*, 384; here from Dieterich's edition in *Jahrb. f. class. Phil. Suppl. xvi*, 812.

⁵ *Pap. Leid. I*, 384 (Dieterich, *op. cit.* 808); *Pap. Leid. J* (*ib.* 775).

⁶ In Dieterich, *Abraxas*, p. 190, 13 ff.

Simon Magus says of himself, "I can make myself invisible to those who would seize me, and again, if I wish to be seen, I can appear before them. If I should wish to flee, I would bore through mountains and pass through rocks as if they were clay. If I should hurl myself from a high mountain, I should be brought to earth unharmed, as if borne up. If I be bound, I will loose myself, and those who fettered me I will lay in bonds; if confined in prison, I will make the doors open of themselves. I will animate statues, so that those who behold them will suppose them to be living men. I will make new trees spring up at once and cause thickets to grow up suddenly. I will throw myself into the fire and I shall not be burned. I change my countenance so as not to be recognized; nay I can show to men that I have two faces. I will turn myself into a ewe or a she-goat. I will cause beards to grow on the faces of little boys. I will fly up into the air, I will produce gold in great quantities, I will make kings and cast them down."

Similar boasts occur elsewhere in the pseudo-Clementine literature. The attempted flight and the fall of Simon Magus, well known in pious legend, are described by Arnobius, II, 12, and in the apocryphal *Acts of Peter*.⁷

With these passages before us, it might seem natural to classify our papyrus as a fragment of what Reitzenstein (*Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, 7 ff.) called aretalogy — an account of wondrous powers exerted by a god, a hero, or a miracle worker. It can hardly be an aretalogy in ordinary narrative form, on account of the use of the first person, nor is it safe to call it a dialogue comparable to portions of the *Recognitiones*; for the objection *καλὸν εἴδωλον, λέγεις κτλ.* is anticipated and stated by the first speaker, the sorceress, not by an interlocutor. One might think of this piece as an essay or lecture; but there is, I think, an objection to this view also. The difficulty lies in the fact that the wonder

⁷ *Actus Petri cum Simone*, 4. 31. 32; *Martyrium Petri*, 2. 3; *Martyrium Petri et Pauli*, 30. 51-56.

worker acknowledges that her power is limited in an important respect — she can not find a love charm — and such limitations are not in the manner of a serious and believing work. It seems to me more likely that we have here a page from a work of fiction, perhaps a romance. We may suppose that in this episode one of the characters, a sorceress, describes her powers and admits their limitations — limitations which may have had calculated consequences in the further development of the unknown plot.

The text here described will eventually be incorporated in a volume devoted to the University of Michigan collection of papyri. With a view to this later rehandling of the matter, I shall be grateful for any suggestions, whether tending to support or to correct the interpretations offered in this paper.

IX. — *Thericles, Potter, in the Light of the Greek Drama*

By WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

IN another connection we propose to study the work of Thericles of Corinth in the field of toreutics.¹ He was famous as an engraver of cups of the precious metals; he was still more famous as a manufacturer of earthenware, especially drinking cups. To such renown did his products attain that Θηρίκλεια became a hall-mark for standard cups — Θηρίκλεια (*sc. ποτήρια*) or κύλικες Θηρίκλειοι. They were highly prized by connoisseurs and collectors of vases even in the pre-Christian centuries. Timaeus speaks of a Thericlean cup as a royal gift (Ath. xi, 471 f.) : Πολύξενός τις τῶν ἐκ Ταυρομενίου μεθεστηκότων ταχθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν πρεσβείαν ἔτερά τε δῶρα παρὰ τοῦ Νικοδήμου καὶ κύλικα Θηρικλείαν λαβὼν ἐπανήκεν (F. H. G. I, 226). The “other gifts” may have been trifles or they may have been immensely valuable; but noteworthy it is that the only gift of the king that is expressly mentioned is the Thericlean cup. It may well have been of graven gold. Owners of Thericlean vases sometimes made much show of such treasures, though ‘Thericleans’ had various rivals among the knowing (Ath. xi, 471 e—472 a) : 'Αδαῖος δ' ἐν τοῖς περὶ Διαθέσεως τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπολαμβάνει Θηρίκλειον εἶναι καὶ Καρχήσιον. ὅτι δὲ διαφέρει σαφῶς παρίστησι Καλλίξεινος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας φάσκων τινὰς ἔχοντας Θηρικλείους πομπεύειν, τοὺς δὲ Καρχήσια. Whether the gift of Nicodemus was of gold or earthenware, Callixenus seems to be talking of two types of earthenware cups; for the Carchesium was regularly a cup of earthenware, while Plutarch has a different assortment of highly valued cups on the possession of which the owners display their pride (*Aem. Paul.* 33) : οἵ τε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας καὶ Σελευκίδας καὶ Θηρικλείους καὶ δσα περὶ

¹ This paper is one of a series of studies on *The Contributions of the Dramatic Poets to Our Knowledge of the Arts and Crafts of Greece*.

δεῖπνον χρυσώματα τοῦ Περσέως ἐπιδεικνύμενοι. These Thericleans, too, may have been vessels of gold; or they may have been pottery. The association with the royal names Antigonus² and Seleucus, whose wealth was proverbial, and the inclusive clause about Perseus' gold dinner service incline us to favor the former hypothesis. Plutarch mentions Thericlean ware in various other passages where the context seems to point to the more costly material.³

At any rate, Thericles' bowls were fit for the use of a hero or a demigod, and Athenaeus, with a pardonable anachronism, suggests that it is a Thericlean from which Alexis makes Heracles refresh himself after the exhausting labors of getting Hesione free (xi, 470 e): ΘΗΡΙΚΛΕΙΟΣ· ἡ κύλιξ αὗτη ἐγκάθηται περὶ τὰς λαγόνας ίκανῶς βαθυνομένη ὡτά τε ἔχει βραχέα ὡς ἀν κύλιξ οὖσα. καὶ μήποτε "Αλεξις ἐν Ἡσιόνῃ Θηρικλείῳ ποιεῖ τὸν Ἡρακλέα πίνοντα, ὅταν οὐτωσὶ λέγει (frag. 85 K.).

γενόμενος δ' ἔννοις μόλις
γῆτησε κύλικα, καὶ λαβὼν ἔξῆς πυκνὰς
ἔλκει καταντλεῖ, κατά τε τὴν παροιμίαν
ἀεί ποτ' εὐ μὲν ἀσκὸς εὐ δὲ θύλακος
ἀνθρωπός ἔστι.

The Thericlean cups were not only individual in shape and handsome, but they were also, it would seem, uncommonly capacious. A more striking allusion to the size of Thericles' cups is given by the bibulous woman in Eubulus' *Campylion* (frag. 43 K., quoted at p. 126 below). In Eubulus we have a contemporary witness. But we are not left to such indefinite allusions to the size of Thericleans for our conception of their capacity. Menander has one that held three cotylae—nearly a quart (*Menagyrtes*, frag. 324 K.): *προπίνων Θηρικλείαν τρικότυλον.* Theophilus has one still bigger and it

² Antigonids and Thericleans are associated again in Clem. Alex. *Paed.* II, 3, 35 (p. 69 Klotz): *ἐρρέτων τοῖνυν Θηρικλεῖοι τινες κύλικες καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες καὶ κάνθαροι κτλ.*

³ E.g. *Philop.* 9; possibly cheaper ware in *Alex.* 67.

is, furthermore, explicitly the product of the potter's craft (*Boeotis*, frag. 2 K.):

τετρακότυλον δὲ κύλικα κεραμεᾶν τινα
τῶν Θηρικλείων, πῶς δοκεῖς; κεραννύει
καλῶς, ἀφρῷ ζέουσαν · οὐδὲ ἀν Αὐτοκλῆς
οὐτως μὰ τὴν γῆν εὐρύθμως τῇ δεξιᾷ
ἄρας ἐνώμα.

The Thericlean this time is a drinking cup; it is made of earthenware; it holds more than a quart; it is convenient to handle. And Theophilus in another play mentions one that held seven cotylae (*Proetides*, frag. 10 K.):

καὶ κύλικ' ἀ(κράτον) Θηρίκλειον εἰσφέρει
πλέον ἡ κοτύλας χωροῦσαν ἐπτ'. Β. ἀγαθῆ τύχη.

A four-cotylae Thericlean were a cup for a Titan! What would be the state of the man who drained a seven-cotylae cup!

Thericlean vases were various as to material, size, and purpose. They were made of earthenware, gold, silver, glass, or wood. They varied from comparatively small to titanic. They were, for the most part and characteristically, drinking cups. But we have a crater also vouched for by no less an authority than Alexis (*Cycnus*, frag. 119 K.):

φαιδρὸς δὲ κρατήρ Θηρίκλειος ἐν μέσῳ
ἔστηκε, λευκοῦ νέκταρος παλαιγένους
πλήρης, ἀφρίζων · ὃν λαβὼν ἐγὼ κενὸν
τρίψας, ποιήσας λαμπρόν, ἀσφαλῆ βάσιν
στήσας, συνάψας καρπίμοις κίσσου κλάδοις
ἔστεψα.

and a Thericlean 'cooler' (*ψυκτήρ*) vouched for by another comic poet, Dioxippus (*Philargyrus*, frag. 5 K.), if the commonly accepted reading is correct:

παρ' Ὀλυμπίχον δὲ Θηρικλείους ἔλαβεν ἔξιτάτους⁴
δύο ψυκτῆρας.

We have, then, in Thericlean ware, cups, mixing-bowls, and, possibly, coolers. But that is not all. Another poet of the

⁴ The Ms. reading *ξ*, *εἴτα τοὺς*, is metrically impossible.

New Comedy adds four more models (Dionysius, *Sozusa*, frag. 5 K.):

ὅσα δ' ἔστιν εἴδη Θηρικλείων τῶν καλῶν,
γύναι, δικότυλοι, τρικότυλοι, δεῖνος μέγας
χωρῶν μετρητήν, κυμβίον, σκύφοι, ρυτά.
B. ποτήρι' ἡ γραῦς, ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲ ἐν βλέπει.

Here, in addition to the types already mentioned, we have a huge *dinus* (a big round mug, as big as a keg and holding nine gallons), a tumbler-shaped cup, bowls (a mug-shaped bowl, drinking-cup), and horns, as well as cylices holding two or three *cotylae*. They are all drinking-cups, all Thericlean ware, and all are beautiful.

In *Olympichus*, named in the fragment of *Dioxippus*, we may possibly have the name of a dealer who sold Thericlean ware; or he may be simply the person from whom the subject of the sentence received the coolers.

But generally the Thericlean is a drinking-cup. Usually we find only the adjective used substantively; and the nouns to which the epithets *Θηρίκλεια* and *Θηρίκλειοι* were applied were, respectively, *ποτήρια* and *κύλικες*. The cylix was, *par excellence*, the characteristic creation of Thericles. That is clear from the passage in which *Athenaeus* continues (xi, 470 e-f): *ὅτι δὲ κύλιξ ἔστιν ἡ Θηρίκλειος σαφῶς παρίστησιν Θεόφραστος ἐν τῇ περὶ φυτῶν Ἰστορίᾳ* [v, 3, 2]. *διηγούμενος γὰρ περὶ τῆς τερεμίνθου φησί· “τορνεύεσθαι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ κύλικας Θηρικλείους, ὥστε μηδένα <ἄν> διαγνῶναι πρὸς τὰς κεραμέας.” κατασκευάσαι δὲ λέγεται τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κεραμεύς, ἀφ' οὐ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἔχει, γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν κωμικὸν Ἀριστοφάνη.* In this passage *Athenaeus* tells us several interesting facts about Thericles: (1) He was a potter, a manufacturer of earthenware; (2) he was a Corinthian; (3) he was a contemporary of Aristophanes; (4) he made a certain type of cup (cylix) that came to be called by his name; (5) that cups of that particular type, though made of most diverse material (wood, e.g., as well as gold, silver, glass, and earthenware) and by most diverse

producers, were also called Thericlean because of their peculiar shape.⁵ We know that Thericlean cups were made at Athens and that the Athenian product also had an enviable reputation.⁵

If Thericles lived "in the time of Aristophanes," as Athenaeus states, he must have been an older contemporary. For we have his date fairly well established, if the restoration suggested in the text of the official catalog of the controller of the treasures of Athena in the Parthenon is correct (*I.G. 170*): [Θηρίκ]λειομ περίχρυσον, σταχύες ΔΙ ἄνω ὑποξύλου καταχρύσον. The inscription, dealing in this item with one of the products of Thericles' art as an artist in metal work, dates certainly from about the year 421-420, whereas Aristophanes' first play was brought out in 427. In 421-420 Thericles had already made such a reputation that his products could be cited in official inscriptions simply as *Θηρίκλεια*; he could, therefore, have been no longer a mere youth; and in that year Aristophanes was but twenty-seven years old and had been before the public but six or seven years. It is safe to conclude that Thericles was a somewhat older contemporary of the comic poet.

In spite of clear and definite statements in regard to the life and work of Thericles, Welcker⁶ goes into an elaborate discussion to prove that our manufacturer of vases and cups never existed; that the name *Θηρίκλεια* was derived from *θηρία*, the beasts with which a certain type of cup was decorated. But he himself almost proves (*Kl. Schr. 509*), what would be perfectly correct, that if the vases had been named from the wild beasts the name must have been not *Θηρίκλειον* but *θηραῖον*. He saves himself by adding another stage in the evolution of the name: "The manufacturer, or the

⁵ Ath. xi, 469 b: ΗΔΥΠΟΤΙΔΕΣ· ταῦτας φησὶν δὲ Σάμιος Λυγκεὺς Ῥοδίος ἀντιδημιουργήσασθαι πρὸς τὰς Ἀθήνησι μικλέοντις, Ἀθηναῖων . . . χαλκευσαμένων τὸν ρυθμὸν τοῦτον. The type or shape would be the same, whether the vase were of metal or of clay. Compare also Ath. xi, 470 e, quoted on p. 122 above.

⁶ *Rh. Mus. VI* (1839), 404 ff., reprinted in *Kl. Schr. III*, 499 ff.

inventor, of such animal-vases would have been called Thericles." With that kind of juggling with Greek names, Homer at one time almost lost his personality, and Demosthenes, Nicias, Sophocles, Theocritus, and almost everybody else might be stricken from the realm of historicity and transformed into mere symbols of the things signified by their names.

The skepticism in regard to the historicity of Thericles seems to have begun with some unnamed authority of Athenaeus, who, after quoting a passage from the Stoic Cleanthes, goes on with a quotation from "others," which seems to have started all the trouble (xi, 471, b-c): *Κλεάνθης δ' ἐν τῷ περὶ Μεταλήψεως συγγράμματι φησι· "τὰ τοίνυν εύρήματα καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα ἔτι καὶ τὰ λοιπά ἔστιν, οἷα Θηρίκλειος, Δεινιάς, Ἰφικρατίς· ταῦτα γὰρ πρότερον συνιστορεῖν τοὺς εύρόντας. φαίνεται δ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖ τοῦτο, μεταβεβληκὼς ἀν εἴη τοῦνομα. ἀλλὰ, καθάπερ εἴρηται, οὐκ ἔστι πιστεῦσαι τῷ τυχόντι."* ἄλλοι δ' *ἰστοροῦσι Θηρίκλειον ὀνομασθῆναι τὸ ποτήριον διὰ τὸ μορφὰς⁷ θηρίων αὐτῷ ἐντετυπώσθαι. Πάμφιλος δ' ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν Διόνυσον τοὺς θῆρας κλονεῖν σπένδοντα ταῖς κύλιξι ταύταις κατ' αὐτῶν.*

Welcker's strongest argument against the historicity of Thericles seems to be the following (*Kl. Schr.* III, 506): "The more we think of the variety and of the age of the most attractive and most perfect forms of Greek vases, the more incredible — yes, the more absurd — would seem the idea that at so late a time a new form of vase (which could then have been nothing more than a variation of an older form and could call only for some certain modification and not for strict imitation) should have caught the public eye, found its way from Corinth to Athens, and there, under the name of a Corinthian potter, become so much the fashion that it kept goldsmiths and woodworkers busy reproducing the same and carried down through all antiquity the name of this one potter only, while from the whole number of vase-makers

⁷ *μορφὰς* is Eustathius' correction for *δοράς*.

and vase-painters whose names have become familiar to us through the signed vases not one has made his way into literature."

But Lucian, who was as keen an art critic as any we know and who knew his history of art quite creditably, believed in the historical Thericles (*Lexiph.* 7): *ποτήρια δὲ ἔκειντο παντοῖα ἐπὶ τῆς δελφινίδος τραπέζης, ὁ κρυψιμέτωπος καὶ τρυηλὶς μεντουργῆς εὐλαβῆ ἔχουσα τὴν κέρκον καὶ βομβυλίὸς καὶ δορυκύπελλον καὶ γηγενῆ πολλὰ οἷα Θηρικλῆς ὥπτα, εὐρυχαδῆ τε καὶ ἄλλα εὔστομα, τὰ μὲν Φωκαῆθεν, τὰ δὲ Κνιδόθεν, πάντα μέντοι ἀνεμοφόρητα καὶ ὑμενόστρακα.* Lucian is describing a rich assortment of china. He has no more question of the historicity of Thericles than he has of that of Mentor. To this essayist Thericles was a potter; he made certain vases in fantastic forms — earth-born monsters. These were not the cylix pattern that Athenaeus emphasizes as peculiar to Thericles, but cups in the form of a griffin, a Pegasus, or some other fanciful creature. We have such vouched for in gold (Astydamas, *Hermes*, frag. 3 N.):

δέκα δὲ κυμβία,
ρέοντα δώδεχ', ὧν τὰ μὲν δέκ' ἀργυρᾶ
ἡν, δύο δὲ χρυσᾶ, γρύψ, τὸ δὲ ἔτερον Πήγασος.

Photius and Suidas also accept the traditional Thericles, the potter. Defining the "offspring of Thericles," a phrase that occurs in the *Nemea* of the comic poet Theopompos,⁸ they explain: *Θηρικλέους τέκνον· κύλιξ, ἦν λέγεται πρώτος κεραμεῦσαι Θηρικλῆς.* Hesychius, too, thinks of him only as potter: *Θηρίκλειος· κύλικος εἶδος ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους κεραμέως.* And so also the *Etymologicum Magnum*: *Θηρίκλειον κύλικα, ἦν λέγουσι, πρώτος κεραμεὺς ἐποίησεν, ὡς φησιν Εὐβουλος, ὁ τῆς μέσης κωμῳδίας ποιητής.* And Eubulus does in substance say just that — in two different plays: *Dolon*, frag. 31 K.,

διένιψα δ' οὐδὲν σκεῦος οὐδεπώποτε
καθαρώτερον γὰρ τὸν κέραμον εἰργαζόμην
ἢ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, ἥνικ' ἦν νέος,

⁸ Frag. 32, 1-3 K. (Ath. xi, 470 f.), quoted on p. 126 below.

and *Campylion*, frag. 43 K.,

ω γαῖα κεραμί, τίς σε Θηρικλῆς ποτε
ἔτευξε κούλης λαγόνος εύρυνας βάθος;
ἡ που κατειδὼς τὴν γυναικείαν φύσιν,
ὡς οὐχὶ μικροῖς ἥδεται ποτηρίοις.

And Eubulus, “the poet of the Middle Comedy” (*Etym. Mag.*), was a contemporary, albeit younger, of the famous potter. In both these passages, we have plain allusion to pottery and to Thericles as a potter. There is also in the *Dolon* a hint at the date of Thericles. If “when *he* was young” is the correct interpretation, then there is, as Bentley long ago pointed out (*Phalaris*, I, 179 Dyce), a direct implication that Thericles was still living but perhaps no longer in active business when the *Dolon* was brought out; that he was an older contemporary of the poet. And that is in perfect accord, also, with the date assigned to the vase manufacturer by Athenaeus — the time of Aristophanes (see p. 122 above).

There is still another witness to the historicity of Thericles from among the comic poets, another slightly younger contemporary of the potter, Theopompus. The sole fragment of his *Nemea* (frag. 32 K.) begins:

χώρει σὺ δεῦρο, Θηρικλέους πιστὸν τέκνον·
γενναῖον εἶδος, ὄνομά σοι τί θώμεθα;
ἀρ' εἰ κάτοπτρον φύσεως, ἡν πλῆρες δοθῆς.

If the cup was the “trusty child” of Thericles, Thericles must have been its parent, its fabricant.

Note, too, the affection with which this toper looks upon and greets his Thericlean cup. There is more than ordinary maudlin affection in the “trusty child;” there is still more affection in the “high-born beauty;” there is a touch of affection also in “nature’s mirror.” The affection is enhanced at the thought of the treasure “full.”

Still another poet of the Middle Comedy seems to bear witness to the historical Thericles as a maker of cups (*Antiphanes*, *Homoeoe*, frag. 174, 4. 6 K.):

καὶ Διὸς Σωτῆρος ἡλθε Θηρίκλειον ὄργανον

..... ἔκαστος δεξιτερᾶ δ' ἔλαβεν.

In all these quotations from the Middle Comedy, the product of Thericles' art is drinking-cups; in the first, it is *κύλικες*; in the second fragment, the cup has, in accordance with the description in Athenaeus,⁹ the peculiar Thericlean shape with swelling body and more than ordinary capacity. Another of the qualities of the original Thericles ware was apparently the purity of the clay; though, obviously, the passage from the *Dolon* is the loud buffoonery of a slave who is regaling his hearer with his skill in "licking a platter clean." There is a play in the double meaning of *καθαρώτερον*—'cleaner,' 'purer.'

Perhaps in consequence of the fineness of the clay and the delicate texture of Thericlean ware, these cups were more than usually fragile. At all events, we have two passages from the New Comedy in which Thericleans meet disaster: (1) Menander, *Theophorumene* (frag. 226 K.):

μέσως μεθύων τὴν Θηρίκλειον ἔσπασεν.

and (2) Alexis, *Agonis* or *Hippiscus* (frag. 5 K.):

μεστὴν ἀκράτου Θηρίκλειον ἔσπασεν
κοίλην ὑπερθύουσαν.

In the word *κοίλην* 'hollow' there is probably an allusion to the deep, swelling body so characteristic of the Thericlean cylix.

In further confirmation of the historicity of Thericles, Pollux also knows of him as a manufacturer of cups (vi, 96): *Θηρίκλειον καὶ κάνθαρον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιησάντων*; and Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* ii, 3): *ἐρρέτων τοίνυν Θηρίκλειοί τινες κύλικες καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες καὶ κάνθαροι*.¹⁰ Pollux thus declares explicitly that the name 'Thericlean' comes from the name of the maker; Plutarch and Clement leave the same to be

⁹ xi, 470 e, quoted on p. 120 above.

¹⁰ Cf. also Plut., *Aem. Paul.* 33, quoted on p. 119 above.

plainly inferred from the fact that they are giving a list of highly prized wares, all named from the owners or patrons of the manufacturing plants that produced them. Indeed, a marginal note in one manuscript of Clement adds (*Paed.* p. 121 Klotz): *Θηρίκλειοι ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους τοῦ εύρόντος.* To the same effect we might quote also the *Etym. Gud.* (p. 261): *Θηρίκλειον· εἶδος ποτηρίου, ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτὸ Θηρικλέους, ὡς φησιν Εῦβουλος;* and Moeris: *Θηρίκλειον· ἀπὸ τοῦ τεχνίτου προσηγορήθη, ὡς Εῦβουλος;* and Thomas Magister: *Θηρίκλειον· εἶδος ἐκπώματος, ἀπό τινος Θηρικλέους τοῦ πρώτου εύρόντος τοῦτο, ὡς φησιν Εῦβουλος.*

To sum up the characteristics of the Thericlean cylix, then, we gather together the following details from the passages already considered: (1) Thericlean cups were made of the purest clay; (2) they had wide-swelling sides and were deeper than the ordinary cups; they had the general appearance, as Welcker describes them, of an inverted tenpin; (3) they had more than the usual capacity; (4) they had ears that were short but served as convenient handles. The fullest single description we have of Thericleans is given us in a fragment of Eubulus, the younger contemporary of Thericles (*Cybeulae*, frag. 56 K.):

ἄρτι μὲν μάλ' ἀνδρικὴν
τῶν Θηρικλείων ὑπεραφρίζουσαν παρά,
κωθωνόχειλον, ψηφοπεριβομβήτριαν,
μέλαιναν, εὐκύκλωτον, ὁξυπύνδακα,
στίλβουσαν, ἀνταυγοῦσαν, ἐκνευιμμένην,
κίσσω κάρα βρύουσαν, ἐπικαλούμενοι
εἶλκον Διὸς Σωτῆρος.

In corroboration of and in addition to the four characteristics listed above, we have in this passage of the comic poet a Thericlean cup that (1) is a man-sized affair; (2) has a lip like that of a Laconian beaker; (3) is made of fine stuff, so that the wine pouring into it makes it ring like a voting urn when the pebbles are poured into it; (4) is perfectly formed on the potter's wheel; (5) is painted shiny black

(μέλαιναν, στίλβουσαν), with red figures (ἀνταυγοῦσαν); (6) has an ivy wreath running about the brim (painted or real?); (7) has a 'pointed bottom.' There is something wrong about the last item. Either the word ὀξυπύνδακα must mean that the bowl sweeps inward to a thin neck connecting it with the base, like a huge goblet, or for ὀξυπύνδακα we should, as Kock suggests, read εὐρυπύνδακα 'with a broad base.'

The comment of the scholiast to Clement (*Paed.* II, 3, 35, p. 69 Klotz) does not help to clear up the difficulties: Θηρίκλειον· τὸ σφαιρικῷ τῷ πυθμένι τὸ ἐπικείμενον ἔχον χωνοειδές, ἀφ' οὐ πιεῖν ἔστιν εὐπετές. "Funnel-shaped" or "pointed at the bottom" is just what the Thericlean bowl was not, according to Athenaeus and the other witnesses; and what a "spherical base" would be doing on a cylix it is hard to comprehend. The scholiast has only roiled the water.

That the typical Thericlean had a jet black varnish, however, we are assured not only by the comic poet Eubulus, but also by Theophrastus in the continuation of the passage quoted on page 122. Theophrastus, after declaring that the turpentine wood was μέλαν δὲ σφόδρα καὶ πυκνόν and that no one could distinguish a Thericlean cup turned out of such wood from an earthenware Thericlean, goes on (v, 3, 2): λαμβάνειν δὲ τὸ ἐγκάρδιον δεῖν καὶ ἀλείφειν τὸ ξύλον· οὕτω γὰρ γίγνεσθαι καὶ κάλλιον καὶ μελάντερον. This gives us a picture of a shiny, black vase with a fine gloss. Such the genuine Thericlean must have been.

But as we have already seen considerable variety in provenience, in material, and also in form of the Thericlean ware, so even in the peculiar matter of the Thericlean drinking cup itself there might be some variety. We have seen that the usual type of the Thericlean cup was deep, with bulging sides. But even a Thericlean might be flat and shallow, though still capacious. To such a cup Aristophon introduces us (*Philonides*, frag. 14 K., where a female servant speaks):

τοιγαροῦν ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀρτίως ὁ δεσπότης
 δι' ἀρετὴν τῶν Θηρικλείων εὐκύκλωτον ἀσπίδα,
 ὑπεραφρίζουσαν, τρυφῶσαν, ἵσον ἵσω κεκραμένην,
 προσφέρων ἔδωκεν, οἷμαι, χρηστότητος εἶνεκα.

The bowl is of earthenware, turned on the potter's wheel (*εὐκύκλωτον*) ; it is wide and flat, like a shield (*ἀσπίδα*), and probably huge, like a shield — a bowl to satisfy another bibulous serving-woman (cf. the servant in Eubulus' *Campylion*, p. 126 above).

From the evidence submitted by so great a cloud of witnesses we can arrive at no other conclusion than that genuine Thericleans of clay were the product of a historical Thericles, and that this Thericles was not only a maker of silver and gold plate but also a potter who conducted a terra cotta plant at Corinth. The direct testimony of Athenaeus, declaring that Thericles was a potter and that he was a Corinthian, is not weakened by the fact that there is "wild-animal-fame" in his name, on which Welcker lays so much stress, nor by the possible suggestion that the real Thericles was exclusively a worker in metal, a maker of cups of silver and gold, of a peculiar type which came eventually to bear his name ; and that these cups, highly prized by connoisseurs and by those who could afford to own them, gave rise to manifold imitations of them in clay ; and that from these imitations, also called Thericlean, later writers spoke of Thericles as a potter, though his own art was exercised not at all in the field of ceramics but confined exclusively to that of toreutics.

Athenaeus may be a late witness ; Lucian also is late ; but Lucian, the keenest of critics, was not one to be misled by an illusion or by a fiction, and Lucian is very clear in his testimony that Thericles was a historical personage and a potter. Photius and Suidas and Hesychius are late, but they probably had good sources for their statements that Thericles was a potter. The *Etymologicum Magnum* is later still, but in the case of this witness the source is quoted — Eubulus, the

comic poet of Athens. And Eubulus, flourishing in the first quarter of the fourth century B.C., may as a lad actually have seen Thericles himself. There was no time between Thericles and Eubulus for the fiction to grow up that the Thericlean potteries were only imitations of Thericlean gold and silver ware; and we have the testimony of Eubulus himself to the fact that Thericles was Thericles and that he was a potter.

We need not attach any weight to the objection that Thericles is not named in the extant comedies of Aristophanes. Neither is any other potter or vase-painter, early or contemporary or late; nor to the further objection that Thericles is the only maker of vases or painter of vases whose name is immortalized in Greek literature; for we shall find one or two others; and it is within the range of possibilities that Euphronius or Brygus or Asteas or some of the rest may yet turn up with new discoveries of Greek literature now lost. But Thericles, at least, the Corinthian potter of the latter half of the fifth century, is historical.

X. — *The Function of the Homeric Simile*

By PROFESSOR SAMUEL E. BASSETT

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

IN examining the similes of Homer as a feature of Homeric style the writer has been impressed by certain details of technique that are not sufficiently recognized. At the same time the poet's use of the simile appeared in a new light. It has seemed worth while to give briefly some of the conclusions resulting from the study, reserving the details for a later article.

The similes on which the following observations are based are found more frequently in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey*, in the later books of the former rather than in the earlier, and in the battle scenes rather than in the interludes. There are about 200 in the *Iliad* and about 40 in the *Odyssey*. They vary in length from 2 to 9 verses, with one in the *Odyssey* of 13 verses. Taken together they amount to nearly 800 verses, a body of poetry comparable in length with Hesiod's *Works and Days*, a book of the *Aeneid*, or an Attic satyr drama — large enough at all events to give a certain validity to any conclusions that may be reached by accurately observing the phenomena which it presents. This we have tried to do, in spite of the natural objection which a friend has made that to gather the similes apart from their setting is like abstracting the plums from a pudding, or, as we say in America, 'eating the raisins from a cake,' — for both the similes and the plums are *ἡδύσματα*.

The 'Homeric simile' must not be confused with the 'simile in Homer.' The simple comparison is one of the most universal means of expressing thought. It marks the second step in the progress of ratiocination, being preceded by metaphor, of which it is the development, and being followed, at some distance, by the effort to think in abstract terms. To the child a lion is first of all a cat; then, like a cat, and, much

later, an animal. This is because analogy is much simpler than analysis, for the critical faculty by which we note differences awakens later than the faculty of association which marks resemblances. Furthermore, the concrete, which is essential in both metaphor and simile, lies in the realm of sense, and sense becomes active in the brain long before the intellect, which deals with abstract ideas. The concreteness of the simile makes it a natural vehicle of expression for the literary artist, especially one who uses the expressions of the primitive mind. Tennyson's "Northern Cobbler," for example, contains more than a dozen similes, and the early poetry of most races abounds in them. But the 'Homeric simile,' the 'long-tailed comparison,' as Addison calls it, translating a phrase of Perrault's, is *sui generis*: it is not so much a comparison as it is a poetic picture which grows out of a comparison, and it is perhaps the most distinguishing feature of Homeric style.¹

From the beginning of Homeric studies the simile has been widely discussed, and in manifold aspects, including its function. Eustathius, who probably sums up the conclusions of antiquity (see especially 176, 20 ff.; 253, 26 ff.; 1065, 29 ff.), calls it one of the *ἡδύσματα* of poetry, and assigns to it in particular four functions: *αὐξησις, ἐνέργεια, σαφήνεια, ποικιλία*, that is, to supply details and to amplify the narrative, to make it more vivid or actual, to make it clear, and to vary the monotony. In the Renaissance the similes were criticized for their merits and defects, and this led to a formulation of their function. Those who defended the excellence of the 'longue queue' based their defense on 'the freedom of the Muse' (Joseph Spence, *Essay on Mr. Pope's Odyssey*; see Finsler, *Hom. in der Neuzeit*, 332). To the functions enumerated by Eustathius may be added that of La Motte:

¹ Jebb notes but one simile of this kind in Hebrew poetry (Job, 6, 15-20); Chadwick, *Heroic Age*, 323, marks it as one of the chief features in which Greek heroic poetry differs from Teutonic. It is found, however, in the Slavic (Drerup, *Hom. Poetik*, 1, 458, Anm. 2).

to exalt or please the mind by means of noble and charming pictures (Finsler, *ib.* 398).

Since the beginning of modern scholarship there have been many conflicting views of the function of Homer's similes. Jebb and Mackail think that they mark crises in the action; Finsler says that they are never found at the critical point; and Stürmer has recently (*Hom. Poetik*, III, 607), by actual count in the *Odyssey*, shown reason for holding both of these views. To Nutzhorn (*Entstehungsweise der Homerischen Gedichte*, 136) the simile helps the poet to depict what he cannot describe, that is, the situation which the listener must visualize at a single glance; to Wilamowitz it interprets the mood of the moment; this Nutzhorn denies. Seymour defined as the purpose of the simile, 'to bring the action into higher relief' (as Rothe remarks, *Od. als Dichtung*, 264, it gives the scene a background). Finsler on the other hand (*Homer*, I², 329) says that it illustrates but a single point of the action or situation, and Ameis-Hentze continually call attention to the 'Vergleichungspunkt.' Finally, Drerup, *op. cit.* 443, has emphasized the importance of the simile in the demarcation of episodes. All these views may be partially true; they fail, however, to give a clear idea of the essential poetic principle which underlies the use of the expanded simile.² The object of the present paper is to give in brief some reasons for seeing in the Homeric simile the chief essentially *lyric κόσμος* (cf. Schol. T on M 41) of the Homeric poems. We shall discuss first the lyric properties of the simile, and then its relation to the narrative.

Pierre Gin in 1786 (Finsler, *Hom. in der Neuzeit*, 249) compared the *Iliad* to a great picture gallery: the large canvases are the battle scenes, and scattered among them are the similes, "charming pictures taken chiefly from nature, which enable the visitor to rest from the fatigue of examining the

² One of the most recent writers on the simile, Fränkel, *Die Homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen, 1921), 98, rightly concludes that the function of the simile is not one, but many.

elaborate paintings." About the same time (1792, Finsler, *op. cit.* 251) Madame Roland writes to Lavater that his letters, coming to her in the midst of a life constantly threatened by the Jacobins, seem like the splendid little pictures that Homer scatters among his battles. These two remarks emphasize the *detachment* of the similes from the narrative. This detachment is both one of form and one of content.

The Homeric simile in form is of two kinds. The first, which may be called the adjective simile, begins as a brief comparison, and is then expanded into a picture by means of a relative clause, often preceded by an adjective. The other kind is, syntactically considered, an adverb, and is introduced by a conjunction. Now it is to be noticed that whereas the brief comparison is embedded in the verse, beginning at every possible place in the first five feet except at the forbidden 'fourth trochaic' caesura, the long simile, whether as expanded by means of a relative clause or as beginning with a conjunction (*ὡς δ' ὅτε* or *the like*), with exceedingly few exceptions begins and ends with the verse. Furthermore, as in the adjective simile the brief comparison which precedes furnishes the illustration, so in the other kind the noun or other word on which the likeness chiefly hinges, almost invariably is placed immediately after the introductory conjunction, so that it can serve its purpose as a comparison and leave the field clear, as it were, for the expanded picture.

Again, German editors have made much of the '*Vergleichungspunkt*.' The word or phrase by which this point is made clear often 'recalls,' as Professor Keith aptly remarks (*Simile and Metaphor in Greek Poetry* [Chicago diss. 1914], 10), 'the essential point of the comparison.' Apparently the poet feels that the expansion of the simile into a picture has led the listener away from the narrative, and so has made necessary this somewhat artificial device of articulation.

The detachment of form is far surpassed by that of con-

tent. One must agree with Saint-Evremond (Finsler, *Hom. in der Neuzeit*, 402) that the detailed simile makes against the clear apperception of the action which it is meant to illustrate. The brief comparison undoubtedly does assist; but when the attention has been withdrawn from the Trojan plain and concentrated upon the fight between a lion and a boar on a lonely mountain, or upon an expert horseman, who picks out four spirited horses from a rich man's herd, and drives them along a crowded boulevard, leaping like a circus performer to the back of now one, now another of the horses, it requires an effort to return to the narrative, and another to put the picture into coördination with it. But this much is gained: the attention returns to the narrative renewed and refreshed. The nature and extent of this refreshment becomes clearer when we note the numerous points of contrast between the material of the *Iliad* itself and that of the similes. In brief these are as follows: —

1. Contrast of Time. Between the remote past and the immediate present. The material of the similes is taken from the experience of the poet's own day and audience. The failure to note this important fact, which Professor Arthur Platt was the first to make clear (*Journal of Philology*, xxiv [1896], 29 ff.), led to the unnecessary assumption of many anachronisms in the *Iliad*.

2. Contrast of Place. Between the Trojan plain, and sky, hill, lowland; the forest and the sea; the sheepfold and the tilled fields of men — rarely the city.

3. Contrast of Theme. Between man, the center of attention in the narrative, and nature, both animate and inanimate. Man plays a minor rôle in the similes; even when the simile describes a contest between man and a wild beast our sympathy is usually with the latter; and we come back to the narrative from watching the forces of nature in conflict or at peace, feeling with Byron, "I love not man the less, but nature more | From these our interviews."

4. Contrast of Social Status. Between the aristocracy,

from which the *dramatis personae* of the narrative are taken, and the common people, whose life furnishes the stuff for most of the similes in which man is introduced.

5. Contrast of Political Conditions. Between war and peace: scarcely half a dozen similes are taken from war.

6. Contrast of Religious Views. Between the continual interference by the personalized Olympian gods, in the actions and fortunes of men, one of the most marked characteristics of the *Iliad*, and a less artistic, if no less primitive, conception of the supernatural.³

All these contrasts indicate the nature of the relaxation which the similes afforded the listener. In following the narrative he was obliged to construct by his creative imagination a mental picture of things more or less foreign to his actual experience: the poet from time to time emphasizes the difference between the epoch in which his characters lived, and his own day. But in the similes the materials are all taken from the listener's own experience, and the appeal is to the associative, rather than the creative, imagination, which is more easily stimulated, and requires less mental effort. The greatest contrast, however, is

7. Contrast of Emotion. Between the kinds of emotion aroused by the narrative and by the similes, respectively. Addison says that Milton never quits his simile, "till he has raised out of it some glorious image proper to inflame the mind of the reader, and to give it that sublime kind of entertainment which is suitable to the nature of an heroic poem" (Essay on *Paradise Lost*, Arber's Reprints, p. 57). Here is a

³ The only case in Homer, for example, in which the word *δαλμων* admits the meaning 'demon,' as my friend Professor Campbell Bonner calls to my attention, is in ε 394 ff., and this is in a simile. This is another illustration of the rule that in the similes the poet allowed himself to refer to the actual experience of his audience — in which the chthonic powers doubtless were thought to play as large a part as the Olympians. See *Class. Rev.* xxxiii (1919), 135, where my correction, marking this passage as the only exception to the rule that in the *Odyssey* the word *δαλμων* is used only in direct discourse and not in the narrative, came too late for insertion in the proof.

fundamental difference between Milton's epic and Homer's. The latter's pictures in the similes are not 'heroic' in the sense that Milton's are. Wordsworth's description of his own lyrical ballads more nearly fits the Homeric similes than do Addison's words, just quoted. In the famous Preface to the second edition Wordsworth says: "The principal object, then, was to choose incidents and objects from common life. . . . Humble and rustic life was chosen because, in that condition, the essential passions find a better soil in which they can attain their maturity . . . because in that condition the passions of men are incorporated with the beautiful and permanent forms of nature." In their attitude towards nature Wordsworth and Homer are much alike. Principal Shairp's essay on Wordsworth offers a good commentary on the Homeric similes: In his treatment of nature there is no exhaustive enumeration of details. Only one or two essentials are given, and then from these Wordsworth passes 'to the sentiment, the genius of the place' (Shairp, *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*, 53). So Homer gives the theme, then the place of the little episode (nearly 150 times in the *Iliad*), more rarely the time (about 10 cases), then a few details, and then not infrequently the sentiment, e.g., 'and the shepherd is afraid, and drives his flock into a cave.' — Wordsworth was familiar with all the moods of nature. He loved the mountains especially. — Homer in his similes refers to the mountains more often than to any other feature of nature, once in every four or five of the expanded similes of the *Iliad*. — And when Wordsworth took for his theme man, it was not from the cities, but from the cottage or farm; *it was 'the shepherd on his hills, or the vagrant on lonely roads.'*⁴

The immediate objection to the lyrical character of the Homeric simile is that it lacks the personal element, the 'I' and the 'You.' To this we answer for the present that after all the essential of a lyric is that it be the 'purest, most typical form of poetry' (Winchester, *Principles of Literary Criticism*,

⁴ For lack of space I shall reserve the parallels in Homer for the later article.

275). This is measured rather by the depth and genuineness of the emotion expressed through sensuous images than by the machinery which is employed. There are many lyrics, both ancient and modern, in which the image is not referred definitely either to the poet or to the listener. "Some whole poems," says Shairp (*op. cit.* 261) of Keble's lyrics, "are little more than descriptions of some scene in nature." It is in the use which he makes of the pictures in the similes, and not in the pictures themselves, that Homer diverges from lyric poetry. The similes must be cast in the form and meter of the epic. But in brevity, detachment, theme, treatment, the similes are pure lyrics. The images are almost always purely sensuous, and they are highly idealized. The language, always concrete, is rarely specific. Similes which, like so many of Milton's, call up some definite scene that can be located on the map, for example, or referred to some well-known event of history or legend, are very rare in Homer's similes. Thus the latter possess at least a certain element of the universal, which is a desideratum of the lyric.

The lyric nature of the Homeric similes appears clearly when they are placed beside similar poetic pictures in poems that are unquestionably lyric. Let us take, first, three descriptions of the continual succession of waves, one description from each of the three poetic genres (the words which indicate the use of the picture in a simile are purposely omitted). The first is from Matthew Arnold's "Dover Beach":

From the long line of spray
When the sea meets the moon-blanch'd land,
Listen! you hear the grating roar
Of pebbles which the waves draw back, and fling
At their return, up the high strand,
Begin, and cease, and then begin again,
With tremulous cadence slow.

The form, the presence of the personal element, and the application (which we have omitted) are all lyric; the picture itself is not more so than in either of the following:—

Sophocles, *Ant.* 586 ff.:

The swollen billows, when, driven by the fierce breath of the sea winds from Thrace, they run o'er the darkness of the deep, and roll up the black sand from the depths, and the buffeted headlands, lashed by the wind, roar mournfully.

Il. Δ 422 ff.:

When on a loud-roaring shore the sea billows rush ever more closely following each other, when Zephyrus hath begun to blow; first a billow raiseth its crest out at sea and then it breaketh on the land with loud thunder; it archeth itself and pileth upon the banks, and spitteth forth the froth of the sea.

If the purest poetry, which is the lyric, be the 'overflow of powerful feelings,' expressed by a sensuous image, Homer's similes may claim that quality. It matters not that the note of the passage last quoted is not melancholy or mournful, like that of the other two; gladness, no less than sadness, may cause the soul to burst forth into song, and the paean can be as lyric as the dirge.

Again, let us compare Homer with the most lyric of all Greek poets, omitting, as before, the words which refer to the use of the image:—

Sappho, frag. 93:

The sweet apple, reddening on the end of a branch, on the highest twig at the top of the tree, overlooked by the apple-pickers — nay, not overlooked, they could not reach it.

Il. Δ 141 ff.:

Ivory, stained with purple by Maeonian or Carian woman to be the cheek-piece of a bridle. It is kept stored away in a treasury. Full many a knight hath ardently desired to have it. But a king keepeth it among his treasures, both as a gaud for his steed and to be the glory of its driver.

This pair of miniatures, in vividness of color and in expressing both the desirability and the unattainableness of the object, are strikingly alike. If Homer is here slightly the less

lyric, it is because he has departed from his custom, and has taken his theme from the life of nobles.

Finally, let us place together, since their likeness of tone has been challenged (by Professor Mackail, *Lectures on Greek Poetry*, 97), two pictures of nature asleep:—

Alcman, frag. 60 (Mackail's translation):

The crests and clefts of the hills are asleep, and the headlands and ravines; and the foliage, and all the creeping things that the dark earth nourisheth, wild, hill-haunting beasts, and the race of bees, and the creatures in the depths of the dark-gleaming ocean, and asleep are the tribes of long-winged birds.

Il. E 522 ff.:

Clouds which Cronion sets motionless on the mountain-tops, on a day when no breath of air stirreth; while sleeps the might of Boreas and the other fierce-blown winds, that with their blowing drive asunder the shadowy clouds with their shrill blasts.

Professor Mackail sees in the first passage something that is "almost like a deliberate challenge to the old by the new poetry." But is not Homer here the better lyric poet? "The emotional effect of the landscape"—we quote again from Professor Winchester, *op. cit.* 131—"does not in strictness proceed from the details which we see, but from the spiritual or imaginative influence of the whole. The poet, therefore, will seek to interpret rather than to describe. Perceiving in what particulars the spiritual power of the scene resides, he will care only for these. He knows that the part is greater than the whole." Homer, with an adverb (*ἀτρέμας*), a noun (*νηνεμίη*), and the contrast between Boreas slumbering and awake, has interpreted the effect of nature's forces asleep, far better than Alcman has done with all his enumeration.

The Aristotelian triad of poetic kinds is valuable for the understanding rather of their respective form, compass, and object, than of their content and details. Each kind uses the distinctive features of the other two, but subordinates them to its own peculiar and predominating manner. Both

Sophocles and Pindar employ the epic narrative; epic and lyric are both at times 'dramatic' and so Homer and Sophocles may be lyric without being any the less epic on the one hand, or dramatic on the other. "Great poets of every age, although the main bent of their genius may have been epic or dramatic, have always felt some impulse to the expression of individual feeling, and have unlocked their hearts in lyric verse" (Winchester, *op. cit.* 276). The impulse comes at moments when the emotion is too great for normal utterance and the soul must burst forth into 'song,' because the emotion, as it were, sets a spark to the imagination, and so liberates one of the images with which the poet's fancy throngs (cf. Santayana, *Poetry and Religion*, 260, and Keble's theory of poetry [Shairp, *op. cit.*, 248]). The form, content, and manner of the 'song,' depend on the poet's personal experience, on the nature of his manifold sensuous images, and on the peculiar poetic influence or body of tradition under which he works. Epic poetry is in essence massed poetry conditioned by heroic theme and treatment. By reason of its wide expanse and its occupation of the field of poetry — at least in the creative stage of the epic — it is all-inclusive (Lang, *Homer and the Epic*, 3). Furthermore in its highest type it deals with battles. So we find that in the *Iliad* about three-fourths of all the expanded similes are connected with the fighting; in the *Odyssey* they are found most frequently in χ , a battle; in ϵ , a contest with the elements; and in ι , a single combat conceived in the spirit of romance. The points at which the similes show a tendency to be placed are the gathering, advance, clash, firm resistance, or retreat of armies; and of single champions the onrush, the fierceness of attack, the firm stand, and the retreat or fall of the defeated. All these are situations which arouse emotions greater than ? the normal. It is reasonable to think that the intensity of the emotion at these points contributed to the use of the expanded simile by stimulating more highly the poetic soul. A second and equally important stimulus was the brief compari-

son itself, out of which the picture grows as a blossom expands from the bud. To a mind so stored with sensuous images as was Homer's, whether entirely from personal observation or also from vivid reaction to poetic tradition, the subject of the comparison would be sufficient to evoke the picture.

To illustrate our meaning, let us take a pair of 'Janus-headed' similes from the *Iliad*, O 624 ff.:

"He fell on them as a wave falleth on a ship," — thus far the comparison; the picture follows: "a vehement wave, wind-nourished by the clouds. The ship is all hidden by the foam. The wind's dread blast thunders on the sail. Trembling seizes the soul of the mariners smitten with terror; so near are they running to the jaws of death. — Thus were torn the hearts in the breasts of the Achaeans."

"But he like a lion bent on mischief, that comes on cows" — again the simile is complete and the little picture begins — "feeding in the wet pastureland of a great marsh, a herd past numbering; and among them a herdsman as yet untaught how to fight a wild beast over the slaughter of an ambling cow. So while the herdsman keeps ever with the foremost or the hindmost cattle the lion springs into the midst of the herd and devours a beast, and the other cows run away in terror. — Thus *then* (*τότε*) the Achaeans retreated in fear."

The emotion of the moment of Hector's irresistible onrush suggests the brief simile now of the wave and then of the lion, and at the same time heightens the poet's extreme sensitiveness to imaginative stimuli, and the mention of the wave and of the lion is the spark which causes the discharge of the picture. The poet seems to feel that he has digressed from his theme by the length of his little episode, and to betray this feeling by the repeated words, by pointing out a second point of comparison at the end of each picture, and, above all, by the use of the adverb *τότε*, which brings the listener back from the present or the universally true, to the particular scene in the remote past.

The function of the expanded simile, in its relation to the

poet, may be summed up in brief by quoting two comments of Schol. T:—

On Δ 482: *πέσεν, αἴγειρος ὡς] μέχρι τούτου τὰ τῆς ὁμοιώσεως· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἐκ περιουσίας ἐναβρυνόμενός φησι καὶ διώκων ἥδονήν.*

On Μ 41: *πρὸς ἐν μόνον ἥνεγκε τὴν εἰκόνα . . . τὰ δὲ ἄλλα οὐδὲν αὐτῷ συντείνει πρὸς τὸ εἰκαζόμενον . . . ἀλλ' ὡς ποιητικὸς κόσμος καλῶς ἔχει.*

That is, the picture is not, strictly speaking, a part of the simile; the poet gives it to us out of the abundance of his mind's store of poetic images, because he loves to do so, and as an appropriate poetic ornament of the epic.

It remains to consider the function of the Homeric simile as it affects the listener. First, let us notice a somewhat analogous use of lyric in another kind of poetry, the odes of Attic tragedy. The chorus belonged to the tradition of drama. The poet made of it what he could, a break in the action and a change in the mental atmosphere, which freshened the attention of the listener; an interpretation of the action or a comment upon it by a vicarious audience or by the mouth-piece of the poet (the '*raisonneur*,' as Mr. Archibald Henderson calls it); but especially a means of heightening the emotional tension of the audience, on the one hand by the sensuous stimuli of music and the color of the costumes, the rhythm of the dance and the highly sensuous language, and on the other by the element of the universal expressed concretely or under the cloak of myth, which always elevates the feelings. With this analogy in mind we may consider in a more general way the function of the Homeric simile, regarding it, at least for this purpose, as that part of the epic which is most clearly lyric.

We must recognize the probability that the expanded simile is likely to have been a tradition of Greek epic poetry, and that it tended to attach itself to incidents of the fighting. Here it serves many purposes. It makes possible the avoidance of description or narration, which would cause the nar-

rative to move too slowly, yet it 'holds the picture' long enough for us to feel its effect. It bridges over intervals of time (Schol. T on Γ 2: *τὸ διάκενον τῆς πορείας ἀναπληροῦσιν αἱ παραβολαὶ*). It adds variety to the account of oft-repeated encounters, all of which use but a few fundamental elements; here it supplements or displaces as ornament both dialogue of a few basic kinds and the brief biography of the contestants, often accompanied by a brief touch of pathos. It heightens the emotion at a salient point in the middle of the action and also at its beginning. But above all it *poetizes* the action. It adds the element of beauty, and envelops the episode with the atmosphere of those peculiar emotions evoked by poetry in its purest form, that is, poetry which is not also the vehicle to carry a narrative, or the means of developing a plot, depicting character, or teaching a lesson. This atmosphere the poet by his similes creates in two ways. He takes the simple and familiar elements of nature and human life, things to which his listeners have become so habituated that their sensuous reaction to them has become dulled, and selects from and combines these into a picture that seems altogether new (Santayana, *op. cit.* 260). This stimulates the calloused sensibilities and sets the imagination in motion. And, secondly, the poet presents an 'imaginative picture of the universal' (Babbitt, *Rousseau and Romanticism*, 41). The sensuous elements of his pictures, and the pictures themselves, are so simple and are found so often in the average life of the poet's day that they are likely to have been a part of the experience of each listener. Thus they deepen and intensify, unconsciously, no doubt, the fundamental emotions of the human soul. But this common experience and these fundamental emotions, however much they are shared in by all, are not exactly the same for any two listeners, since the contents and the reaction of each mind differ from that of all others. Hence the imagination of each is awakened to produce a mental picture more or less closely related to his own ego. This makes the action in which the

picture is embedded seem more familiar and intimate; at the same time it is bathed in a hue and mood of nature best compared to the fairyland-like effect of sunrise on some morning in early June.

There are two points in our discussion in which we would not be misunderstood. The first concerns the relation between the simple comparison and the expanded picture. The line of demarcation is not always clearly marked. And of course we cannot say that the poet in all cases thinks *consciously* first of the comparison and then of the picture. The two may well be fused together in his mind. We have merely tried to analyze the process which results in the picture. Secondly, no one can say how far the element of 'professionalism' (as Mr. Clutton-Brock calls it) enters into the similes, and how much is spontaneous originality. In the later battles the similes are more frequent, run to greater length, and show a greater tendency to be measured. This may be mere mannerism, or it may be due also to the cumulative emotion of the story, and to the growing fatigue of the listener, which makes necessary more 'seasoning' ($\eta\deltaυσ\tau\alpha$) in the dish of Homer's $\muεγάλη\ δαι\ς$. To us the Homeric simile, as used in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, is new and spontaneous, and even if the poet is following the traditional manner, our theory of its *rationale* is not affected.

We sum up our discussion by focussing attention on these points:

- I. The Homeric simile, by reason of its detachment, does not serve the purpose of the simple comparison used by all good story-tellers.
- II. In length, theme, treatment, and spirit, it is lyrical; in fact it is the chief lyrical *κόσμος* of the epic.
- III. In origin, whether this is to be found in the inventive genius of Homer or in the evolution of the epic through generations of poets, it springs both from the heightened emotion of the moment in the action at which it is introduced and from the sensuous image suggested to the poet's highly

thronged and extremely sensitive imagination by the simple comparison.

IV. Its effect upon the listener — which is really what we mean by its function — is to help arouse as much as possible a similar degree and kind of emotion by adding the element of beauty and of the universal in the imagination, thus evoking a higher emotional and perceptive potential. The Homeric simile does not so much make the action clearer or more vivid and actual, as it clarifies, or rather stimulates, the mind of the listener, and makes it more responsive to the mood or action of the narrative.

XI. — *The Priapea and the Vergilian Appendix*

By PROFESSOR ROBERT S. RADFORD

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

I. Introduction. 'Impersonations' of Tibullus.

Versus Ovidii Nasonis

IT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT ARTICLE TO INVESTIGATE THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE GREAT *Priapea*¹ AND ITS RELATION TO THE VERGILIAN APPENDIX. THE *Priapea* IS AN AUGUSTAN COLLECTION OF EIGHTY ELEGANT AND WITTY, BUT JOCOSE AND LICENTIOUS POEMS IN HONOR OF PRIAPUS, WHICH HAVE COME DOWN TO US IN THE MANUSCRIPTS UNDER THE NAME OF VERGIL, AND WHICH, ACCORDING TO THE ANCIENT TESTIMONY, HAVE FORMED FROM THE FIRST AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE APPENDIX. WITH SUCH CLEAR AND DEFINITE ATTESTATION, THE COLLECTION NECESSARILY FOUND A PLACE IN NEARLY ALL THE EARLY EDITIONS OF VERGIL OF THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES, BEGINNING WITH THE *princeps* OF 1469, THOUGH THE OBJECTIONABLE CHARACTER OF THE CONTENTS LED MANY OF THE LEARNED EDITORS TO OMIT OR TO CHANGE THE ASRIPTION. AS REGARDS THE APPENDIX ITSELF, IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT EDITORS AND CRITICS HAVE BEEN AGREED FOR CENTURIES THAT FEW, IF ANY, WORKS CONTAINED IN IT CAN BE JUSTLY ASCRIBED TO VERGIL. IN RECENT YEARS, HOWEVER, FRIEDRICH VOLLMER, THE LATEST EDITOR OF THE APPENDIX, HAS UNDERTAKEN, IN A VERY CONFIDENT MANNER, IN HIS WELL-KNOWN ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN THE *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.*, 1907, PP. 335-374, TO SET ASIDE THE ALMOST UNANIMOUS JUDGMENT OF SCHOLARS,² AND HAS WISHED TO MAINTAIN, ON THE BASIS OF

¹ There is only one great *Priapea*, and this is to be carefully distinguished from any casual or dispersed poems upon Priapus — such as the three pieces at the head of the *Catalepton* (*Cat.* I-III) or Martial's scattered epigrams (VI, 16. 49. 72. 73; VII, 91) — which, without the least vestige of ancient or manuscript authority, have sometimes been given the title of *Priapea* by the moderns, often with the express purpose of minimizing the great *Priapea* and obscuring its unique position; cf. Birt in his edition of the *Catalepton* (Leipzig, 1910), p. 2.

² He himself writes (*op. cit.* 332): "The universal opinion today rejects all the poems of the Appendix, with the exception of a few pieces of the *Catalepton*."

external evidence alone, that the Appendix contains the genuine youthful works of Vergil. No one will deny that Vollmer is an admirable textual critic and a most trustworthy and capable editor, but on complex literary questions his judgment — expressed in a singularly hasty and fragmentary study — seems to the present writer of little weight in comparison with that of Naeke, Ribbeck, Baehrens, L. Müller, Buecheler, Leo, Munro, and Ellis. It must be admitted, however, that his work has appeared at a most propitious moment, and that his essentially emotional and wholly uncritical views have gained numerous adherents, who have ransacked every part of the Appendix in the search for supposed biographical data and have exulted lustily in the discovery of a 'new Vergil.' Strangely enough, in all this eager, yet, for the most part, quite superficial study, the great *Priapea* (which, *verecundiae causa*, has usually since 1573 been removed from the Appendix, and like the *Aetna*, been printed separately) has been entirely overlooked, and it seems desirable at the present time to remedy this grave and wellnigh fatal omission. Before we examine the *Priapea* in detail, however, it will be necessary to make a number of preliminary general observations both upon the Tibullan and the Vergilian Collections, and also briefly to review Vollmer's remarkable conclusions of 1907.

In my article on "The Juvenile Works of Ovid," published last year in *T.A.P.A.* li, 146 ff., I refuted the long-accepted belief that Ovid composed only in dactyls and established the spondaic character of his early poems in a manner which, it is safe to say, will never be seriously called in question. Thus the youthful *Halieutica* shows 57.2% of spondees; the epilogue to the first book of the *Amores* (i, 15) shows in 21 hexameters 57.1%; in 81 hexameters the three poems, ii, 4, iii, 8 and 10, show 53.1%, etc. When, with the approval of his patron (*Pont.* ii, 3, 75), he edited the Messalla Collection (Tib. ii-iv), the spondees were still considerably prevalent." There is no adequate discussion of the views of his predecessors in Vollmer's article, only a constant neglect and ignoring of those views.

ponderant in his elegies. But there is a feature of this Collection which is much more striking and, to the modern mind, much more sensational than the metrical composition. I mean the three artistic 'imitations' or 'impersonations' of Tibullus, namely, elegies iv, 13 and ii, 3 and 5, in which the names of Tibullus and Nemesis are freely used without authorization, and which appear therefore at first sight to be actually written by Tibullus. We might therefore perhaps apply to them the term 'playful forgeries,' but in point of fact these three elegies are far from being gross and deliberate literary frauds, such as were perpetrated, for example, upon Shaksperean scholars with such notable success by William Henry Ireland in 1795-1796. They are rather dramatic and artistic impersonations of the sort that have been consecrated by the genius of Chatterton or the 'younger Anacreon' or the theosophical author of the Fourth Gospel, and such as well befit the author of the twenty-one Epistles of the Heroines and of the Sulpicia letters. The spurious character of iv, 13, which was perhaps first asserted by the learned English translator, James Grainger, in 1757, has since been perceived by very many critics, but it has been most fully and most acutely shown in our own day by Postgate, *Journal of Philology*, ix (1880), 280, and *Selections from Tibullus*, 191 ff. Postgate's final judgment (*Selections*, 198), in which he apologizes for having formerly denounced this beautiful piece as a common forgery, is most justly expressed, and is quite similar, in fact, to the conclusions of Grainger: "Some admirer of Tibullus . . . wrote it, we may conjecture, to amuse himself or his friends, and introduced the name of Tibullus simply to give an air of verisimilitude to the production." My forthcoming study of the language and metre of Book iv not only confirms at every point the results of Postgate's brilliant criticism, but also shows the unmistakably Ovidian origin of this elegy. The second or posthumous book contains two similar 'impersonations' of much greater extent and of a much more ambitious character, namely, ii, 5 and 3. Gruppe,

Röm. Elegie, 69–101, first—after Scaliger and Heyne—seriously attacked the problem of the great Messalinus or national elegy (II, 5), and with much ingenuity sought to solve the immense difficulties which it presents, by the hypothesis of enormous interpolations introduced into the piece after the death of Tibullus. His views were accepted in the main by a long line of well-known Tibullan scholars.³ It was reserved, however, for W. Wissner, in a very complete program (*Über Tibull*, II, 5, Eutin, 1874) to reach a correct solution of the problem. Limiting himself narrowly to the arrangement of the poem, Wissner showed that the composition throughout was immature and, in a technical sense, thoroughly bad.⁴ He correctly concluded therefore that the whole elegy was spurious. Wissner's work is an even more brilliant and convincing piece of criticism than Postgate's study of IV, 13, but it is wholly inadequate for present needs. My own study of this great elegy, which is necessarily an extended one, embracing language, metric, and mythology, shows the correctness of Wissner's conclusions and the Ovidian character of the whole poem.⁵ The elegy II, 3 is also a spondaic poem, but in my former article in the *Transactions* (p. 158) I still attributed it, *verecundiae causa*, to Tibullus, not wishing to seem overeager to despoil of his traditional works 'the poet who first brought Roman elegy to perfection,' and preferring therefore to err on the side of conservatism and caution. Even a moderate use, however, of indices and lexicons, such as was necessary in examining II, 5 and IV, 2–14, soon showed me how utterly impossible it was, both on the score of the

³ Enumerated by Hiller, *Tibullus*, xv; Ehrengruber, *De panegyrico*, I, 13; Baehrens, *Tib. Blätter*, 24. Baehrens (p. 36) argues with some plausibility that the invocation of Apollo (Augustus) in vs. 79 refers to the events of 18 B.C. and was therefore composed subsequent to the death of Tibullus.

⁴ Although the poem, viewed as a whole, is one of the finest and most brilliant productions of Roman elegy, it is seen, when minutely examined, to be astoundingly weak in the development of its thought, and resembles nothing so much as the *Culex*, which proceeds from the same author.

⁵ Owing to other engagements, I cannot hope, however, to publish my study, nearly complete though it is, at once — perhaps not for two or three years.

language and the recondite Alexandrine mythology, any longer to ascribe this poem or any part of it to Tibullus. It is clear therefore that when Tibullus, always indifferent to literary fame, died suddenly in the same year as Vergil, 19 B.C., he left only three unpublished elegies (II, 1, 4, and 6), which constituted in all only two hundred and four verses and were far too few to form a poetical book of five hundred lines.⁶ Several years later,⁷ Ovid, the younger and much more gifted poet of the circle, was commissioned by Messalla to publish the master's scanty literary remains and was encouraged to add his own juvenile works.⁸ The Messalla Collection, which is the result of his labors, is the noblest tribute which a younger poet has ever paid to an older one; it is—with the exception of the Socratic dialogues of Plato—the most generous gift which a loving disciple has ever offered to the memory of a revered master. Surely Ovid might have well described his relation to his predecessor in the fine lines of Lucretius (II, 3 f.):

Inque tuis pono pressis vestigia signis,
Non ita certandi cupidus quam *propter amorem*
Quod te imitari aveo.

In truth, but for the copious additions so freely made by the youthful editor, we may well doubt whether the slender volume (*libellus*) of Tibullus would have long retained its fame or would have come down to posterity at all. The place which Tibullus has enjoyed in Roman literature, he owes largely then to the self-sacrificing devotion of Ovid, his greater disciple.⁹

⁶ See Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 286 ff., and Ullrich, *Studia Tib. De libri secundi edit.* (Berlin, 1889), 58 ff.

⁷ I no longer think that the second book was published in 19 B.C.; the whole Collection was issued perhaps about 15-14 B.C.

⁸ So at least we interpret *Pont.* II, 3, 75 ff. Many scholars have held that the publication could have taken place only after Messalla's death (cf. Schanz, *Röm. Lit.* § 278). Our favorable judgment of Ovid is based upon the *motive* which impelled him.

⁹ Gruppe, *op. cit.* 268, held that the Sulpicia elegies were the finest things in

As is well known, Ovid has constantly given expression in his works to the love and veneration which he felt for all the great poets of Rome and Alexandria.¹⁰ I may quote here from the Vergilian Appendix, by way of anticipation, still another example of Ovid's veneration for his great predecessors; it is a very striking illustration, yet one which has been misunderstood for centuries. In the Bembinus and other related manuscripts,¹¹ immediately following the *Vita Bernensis*, the actual Appendix begins not with the *Culex*, as is usually but erroneously assumed, but with the *Versus Ovidii Nasonis de Vergilio* (*Anth. Lat.* 1, 1-10 Riese). This poem is the preface to Ovid's monostich and decastich arguments to the twelve books of the *Aeneid*, 132 verses in all (*ib.* 1, 11-142), and in it Ovid apologizes humbly to his beloved Vergil for the liberty which he has taken in abridging the divine *Aeneid*:

Vergilius magno quantum concessit Homero,
Tantum ego Vergilio Naso poeta meo.
Nec me praelatum cupio tibi ferre, poeta:
Ingenio si te subsequor, hoc satis est.
· · · · ·
Adfirmo gravitate mea, me carmine nullum
Livoris titulum praeposuisse tibi.

Since the Appendix was originally an anonymous work, it is not likely that these verses formerly preceded the *Culex* and opened the collection, but it is not improbable that both they and the tetrastich preface of Ovid to the arguments of

'Tibullus': "They are the very soul of poetry. . . . The whole Roman world has nothing similar to offer." Cf. also Schanz, *op. cit.* § 284, p. 238. Plessis also (*Poésie Lat.* 376) has written eloquently of the debt which Tibullus owes to the 'beautiful verses of Lygdamus.' In general the famous and oft-quoted verses of the Tibullan Corpus are not the lines of Tibullus at all, but those of Ovid.

¹⁰ E.g., *Trist.* iv, 10, 41, colui fovique poetas, | quotque aderant vates, rebar adesse deos; *ib.* v, 3, 55, veterum digne veneror cum scripta virorum. See also the eloquent passage on Ovid's 'literary *candor*' in S. G. Owen's article "Ovid," *Ency. Brit.*¹¹ xx, 388.

¹¹ Sommer, *Catalepton* (Halle, 1910), p. 7; Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 31; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 11.

the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics*¹² stood among the lost *Epi-grammata*. It makes little difference that the critics of the sixteenth century, from whom our current views are derived, not knowing the relation of eager discipleship and of 'sedulous apery'¹³ which the youthful Ovid voluntarily assumed to all his great predecessors, too hastily pronounced the Ovidian prefaces and arguments spurious. They did not have before them the elaborate studies of Zingerle (*Ovid u. sein Verhältnis zu d. Vorgängern*, Innsbruck, 1869-1871) and of Ganzenmüller ("Aus Ovids Werkstatt," *Philologus*, LXX (1911), 274-311, 397-437), which reveal fully Ovid's extraordinary and almost unprecedented genius for imitation, nor had they read the violent and angry diatribes which Ehrengruber (*op. cit.* x, 71-75; II, 28; III, 80, etc.) and Némethy (*Ciris* [Budapest, 1909], pp. 6-24, 44) have poured forth against the unknown author of the *Panegyric* and the *Ciris* as 'the most vile, cunning, and contemptible of imitators,' 'the most shameless and insolent of plagiarists, plunderers, and freebooters,' 'the villainous ape of Lucretius, Catullus, and Vergil,' 'the upstart crow (*cornicula*),' etc.¹⁴ They could not know there-

¹² *Carmen tetrasticon Ovidii Nasonis (Qualis bucolicus, quantus tellure domanda, etc.) Anth. Lat. 2, 1-4.*

¹³ "I have played the sedulous ape to Hazlitt, to Lamb, to Wordsworth, to Defoe, etc. . . . That is the way to learn to write. . . . It was so Keats learned." — Robert Louis Stevenson in "A College Magazine," *Memories and Portraits*, p. 122, — the *locus classicus* in English literature on youthful imitation. See also Stempling, *Das Plagiat in d. griech. Lit.*, Teubner, 1912, and the chapter on "The Classical Theory of Imitation" in Fiske's *Lucretius and Horace*, Madison, 1920. One can only regret that many of the writers upon the Tibullan and Vergilian Appendices seem so totally ignorant of certain phases of general literary history.

¹⁴ Cf. Ribbeck, *Röm. Dicht.* II, 354 (of the author of the *Ciris*), 'this diligent imitator and freebooter.' We might quote also for Némethy's benefit the invective of Lenaeus, the freedman of Pompey, against Sallust ("nebulonem popinonemque, et vita scriptisque monstrosum, praeterea priscorum Catonisque verborum ineruditissimum furem," Suet. *Gram.* 15) and Greene's well-known attack upon Shakspere: "There is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers,—in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a Countrie." In truth it is now generally recognized that Shakspere was much less original than Marlowe and Ben Jonson and, in some respects, less original than Beau-

fore that our poet esteemed it the highest privilege to perform even the most menial offices for Vergil and for Tibullus, and, seeking to follow everywhere closely in their footsteps, was content if he should be touched even by the faint and distant reflection of their fame.

I have therefore examined the prefaces (and metrical arguments) afresh with much care, and I find, for example, that they everywhere show — quite unlike the arguments of Sulpicius Apollinaris to the *Aeneid* — the masterly treatment of the penthemimetal caesura which appears in the *Lygdamus*, *Catalepton*, ix, *Ciris*, *Priapea*, etc., and which marks the consummate future artist. They have also most conspicuously the Ovidian phraseology, and the same is true of the arguments also, wherever the latter do not reproduce the original language of Vergil. Their genuineness is therefore fully attested by both external and internal evidence.

We may return for a moment to the Tibullan Appendix. We are struck by the fact that not only the Messalinus and Sulpicia elegies which were written expressly and solely for the Tibullan volume show the Tibullan form of the pentameter with dissyllabic close, but the same is true also of the *Lygdamus* poems which were originally composed independently. On the other hand, the elegies of the Vergilian Appendix,¹⁵ some of which, like the *Copa*, were written long after the *Lygdamus*, have the pre-Tibullan form with polysyllabic close. The explanation is that the *Lygdamus* poems have been revised in this respect with the special purpose of fitting them to the elegant corpus in which they stand. The scrupu-

mont and Fletcher; see, e.g., Thorndike, "Shakspeare as a Debtor," in *Columbia University Shaksperian Studies* (New York, 1916), 165-184. Not owing to any poverty of intellect, but to the liveliness and sensitiveness of his genius (L. Müller, *De re metrica*², 79), Ovid is indeed the prince of imitators among the Augustans — surpassing in this respect even Vergil himself — just as Raphael is the chief of adapters and assimilators among the painters of the Renaissance, now 'aping' Viti or Francia or Perugino, now Leonardo or Fra Bartolommeo, now Michelangelo, etc.

¹⁵ Except the *Priapea* and the *Maecenas*; see below, pp. 161 f.

lous artist who apologized for composing the epistle of Sappho, the lyric poetess, in elegiac verse (*Her.* 15, 5), and also for writing the invectives of the *Ibis* in the same metre (*Ib.* 45), and who, in 11, 5, expressly and purposely introduced one or two minor Tibullan refinements into his own metrical schemes, was not likely to overlook propriety in the pentameter closes which strike even the eye. We shall need also probably to bring down the first edition of the *Amores* from 15 B.C. nearer to 12 or 11 B.C.; it was probably later than the *Copa* (15 B.C.), as it was earlier than the *Consolatio*¹⁶ and the *Maecenas* (9 and 8 B.C.). The genius of Ovid matured very slowly, and in respect to powers of abstract thinking and even excellence of composition, was never perhaps full-grown.

II. Authorship of the Vergilian Appendix. Biographical Details. 'Impersonations' of Vergil. Circumstances of Publication

In my former article I gladly accepted the conclusions of Ribbeck, Baehrens, Birt, Marx, Schanz, and Braum, who, on important metrical and stylistic grounds, had identified the author of *Catalepton*, ix with Lygdamus, that is, with the youthful Ovid. In fact, the eminent Hungarian Latinist, Geyza Némethy, whose work was at first unknown to me, had as early as 1909 expressly ascribed this elegy to Ovid, but his views, though cogent, were almost universally set aside and derided. As regards the remaining works of the Appendix, the extensive use of Burman's Index showed me beyond question that the *Ciris*, *Aetna*, and *Culex* were Ovidian productions, but since I was then insufficiently acquainted with the recent literature of the subject, I carefully refrained from expressing any judgment upon the collection as a whole. I have since had an opportunity to study the most important discussions upon the Appendix, and I purpose to give my own conclusions in full in a separate article. It seems desirable,

¹⁶ Ehrengrub, *op. cit.* x, 18, rightly declares the *Consolatio* genuine on metrical grounds.

however, to summarize these views very briefly here. The whole Appendix, as is shown unmistakably by the language and diction, is clearly the work of Ovid, and was attributed by the ancient grammarians to Vergil on wholly insufficient grounds. We may consider first the status of the *Culex*, which, in ancient times, was much the most famous piece of the collection, and was believed to have been addressed by the youthful Vergil to his schoolmate Octavius, the future Octavianus Caesar. Fortunately we possess a sufficiently authoritative and complete dissertation upon the language of the *Culex* by a pupil of Birt's, W. Holtschmidt (*De Culicis carminis sermone*, Marburg, 1913) a very large part of which is devoted to showing in detail the close relationship which exists between the *Culex* and the language of Ovid, a relationship which was first noted in part by Birt himself many years ago (1876). The conclusion reached by Holtschmidt (p. 125) is clear and definite enough: "Non pauca eaque gravissima — indicia declarant pendere Culicis scriptoris sermonem ex Ovidiano." Holtschmidt finally falls, however, into the same technical error that Ehrengruber has committed in the case of the *Panegyric*, and, in accordance no doubt with Birt's suggestions, maintains (p. 126) that the writer of the *Culex* lived *after* Ovid and adopted his language. This last view is, however, quite impossible. For Skutsch had pointed out as early as 1901 (*Aus Vergils Frühzeit*, 125) that Ovid himself was thoroughly well acquainted with the *Culex*, and a still larger number of Ovid's unmistakable imitations (or 'self-loans') have been collected by Plésent in his well-known monograph.¹⁷ The really essential work on the authorship of the *Culex* has therefore already been done, and we may safely pronounce the poem a composition of the youthful Ovid in the certainty that no responsible critic who has access to the two works just named is likely seriously

¹⁷ *Le Culex. Étude sur l'Alexandrinisme latin* (Paris, 1910), 33-35, 119-121. See also P. Jahn's review of Plésent in *Berl. phil. Woch.* xxxi (1911), 1376, and Teuffel-Kroll, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* II⁷, § 230, 2.

to challenge this statement. In ancient times, as is shown by the well-known title prefixed to the *Culex* in the Bembinus and related manuscripts (see Vollmer's edition, *P.L.M.* I², 45), the Octavius to whom the poem is addressed (vss. 1 and 25) was universally identified with Octavianus Caesar. This view is wholly erroneous, and it has not only been maintained, but has been definitely proved by Ribbeck, *App. Verg.*, pp. 9 and 20,¹⁸ that the real person addressed is Octavius Musa, the gifted historian and poet who is commemorated also in two poems of the *Catalepton* (iv and xi). Ribbeck's conclusions have been adopted by Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 27, and *Tib. Blätter*, 56, by Plessis, *Poésie lat.* 260, and by Rand "Young Vergil's Poetry," *Harv. Stud.* xxx (1919), 116, 137.¹⁹ Ribbeck is mistaken at only a single point. The youth in whose honor the *Culex* was written is not Octavius Musa, the governor of Mantua and member of the older circle of Messalla (*Hor. Serm.* I, 10, 82), but, as Haupt already saw, his son, Octavius Musa the Younger, the patron and contemporary of Ovid. Finally, in my judgment, Skutsch (*op. cit.* 132), is to be earnestly commended for the admirable proof which he has given that the poem itself shows no trace whatever of forgery in Vergil's name.²⁰

¹⁸ Ribbeck's proof is derived from the references to history and 'the Muse' contained in vss. 4, 6, 8, 24, 26-34.

¹⁹ This last is a learned and serious work, much more so, in my judgment, than Vollmer's original article of 1907, and it is based upon comprehensive study. It gives far the best account of the Vergilian Appendix which is accessible in English, and traces also in a most convincing and happy manner *some poet's* early development (not Vergil's, I think). Though usually accepting Vollmer's conclusions, Rand presents not a few correct and helpful views of his own, *e.g.*, the place of the *Aetna* in the Appendix (p. 155), and the clever recovery (as it seems to me) of one of the lost *Epigrammata* (p. 140, n. 8). I only wish that Professor Rand could be induced to transfer a part, at least, of this brilliant sketch to his forthcoming volume on Ovid. I may add that he very kindly sent me a copy of his article at a time when my acquaintance with recent discussions was very incomplete, and I have found it a very delightful and valuable introduction to the whole subject.

²⁰ Skutsch is mistaken, however, in thinking that it was addressed to Octavianus.

I pointed out in my former article (p. 159) that both the *Ciris* and *Catalepton*, ix, which has so many correspondences with it,²¹ fit unmistakably into Ovid's biographical data. For he was twenty-five years old March 20, 18 B.C., and could therefore have become a candidate for the quaestorship in that year.²² We know, however, that he did not do this, but definitely renouncing a public career, repaired to Athens for the study of philosophy (*Trist.* 1, 2, 77), attending the lectures of the Garden (*Cir.* 3) as Horace, twenty-five years before, had devoted himself to the teachings of the Academy (*Epist.* II, 2, 45). This is, however, the precise date which many of the best authorities, such as Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 32, Kreunen, *Proleg. in Cirin* (Utrecht, 1882), 64, Leo, *Herm.* XXXVII (1902), 150, Schanz, II³, 1, § 241, p. 98 and § 320 a, p. 374, and Teuffel-Schwabe, § 230, 2, 1, have already selected for the *Ciris* solely on the ground of the relation which the poem bears to the whole *Aeneid*. Moreover, during the last thirty years most authorities, such as Ellis, *A.J.P.* xv (1894), 493, P. Jahn, *op. cit.* 86, Sudhaus, *Herm.* XLII, 476, Knaack, *Rh. Mus.* LVII, 221, Schanz, § 241, p. 98, and Teuffel-Kroll, § 230, 2, 1, have held that Ovid knows the *Ciris* and imitates it freely in all his works, especially in his own version of the story of Scylla (*Met.* VIII); only a few scholars have sought to make the poem later than Ovid and dependent upon him. The resemblances also between the *Ciris* and the various poems of the *Catalepton* are collected by Sommer, *op. cit.* 44-48, 104-106, Drachmann, *Herm.* XLIII (1908), 425, and Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 186 ff. Finally, it has long been recognized that the *Ciris* and *Culex* are most closely bound up with the *Lygdamus*, e.g. by Klee-

²¹ Cf. P. Jahn, *Rh. Mus.* LXIII (1908), 100: "No Latin poem in a restricted space (especially in vss. 47-53) shows proportionately so many parallels to the *Ciris* as *Cat.* ix, which is likewise dedicated to a Messalla." *Cat.* iii also shows many striking parallels, and Jahn concludes (p. 101) that "all three poems evidently proceed from one and the same poet."

²² The ordinary age for holding the quaestorship under the Empire was (twenty-four or) twenty-five; see Furneaux or Nipperdey on *Tac. Ann.* III, 29, 1; Müller's *Handbuch*, IV², 2, § 6, p. 45.

mann, *De libri III carminibus*, 30, and Némethy, (*Lygdamis carmina*, p. 30 and notes on 4, 17. 89; 5, 1, etc.; *Rh. Mus.* LXII [1907], 484). Since such valuable results have already been reached, it must be clear that for absolutely conclusive proof of Ovidian authorship, we need only a detailed study of the language of the poem such as Holtschmidt has already given us in the case of the *Culex*; my own extensive collection of material, though sufficient for most practical purposes, is not at present complete enough for publication.

Of the same date as the *Ciris* is the most famous piece of the *Catalepton* (v), in which the boy poet, renouncing rhetoric and love-poetry, turns eagerly and joyously to the pursuit of philosophy. Ovid, writing here *in propria persona*, expresses the same purpose as in *Cir.* 10 f., namely, to 'give the Muses a rest' and to devote himself exclusively to severer studies. In spite of the mention of Siron, the famous Epicurean philosopher and teacher of Vergil, the poem itself bears no relation whatever to Vergil, and *dicta Sironis* (vs. 9) is evidently used in the same sense as *dicta libelli Sironis* (cf. *Aetna*, 538) or *dicta Epicuri* (cf. *Lucr.* III, 12). The Sextus Sabinus mentioned (vs. 7) is perhaps the well-known Sabinus of *Am.* II, 18, 27.

The *Aetna* is a product of the year spent with Macer in Sicily; cf. *Pont.* II, 10, 23: *vidimus Aetnaea caelum splendescere flamma*. The poet who visited the temple of Minerva at Troy (*Fast.* VI, 423), had also stood, as we see from *Aetna*, 588–591, at Sigeum and Rhoeteum beside the tombs of Achilles and of Hector. The works of art mentioned in verses 594–598, which have caused so much discussion, are simply those which Ovid constantly uses for illustration in his other works, and the everlasting reference to Erigone, the 'faultless poem' of Eratosthenes, which he is scarcely able to keep out of any of his productions²³ and introduces even into the *Priapea* (62, 2), turns up of course serenely in the *Aetna* (587). The numerous parallelisms between the *Aetna* and Ovid, also

²³ See the passages in Ehrengruber, *op. cit.* I, 44.

between the *Aetna* and the *Ciris*, *Culex*, *Moretum*, etc., have been collected in part by Alzinger, *Studia in Aetnam collata* (Leipzig, 1896) 50-54, 3-20, and by Sudhaus in his edition (Leipzig, 1898); these include the astounding coincidences with Ov. *Am.* III, 12, 35 and 39, which Sudhaus discusses briefly and inadequately (p. 97).

The *Dirae* also was either composed or translated in Sicily (cf. vs. 9, *Trinacriae . . . gaudia*), and Naeke, *Val. Cato*, 22, 256, C. Fr. Hermann, *Ges. Abh.* 118, and Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* are therefore right in concluding from the text of the poem that the estate from which the owner has been dispossessed was situated on the sea and near high mountains. These references to Sicily and the scenery of the Sicilian coast have usually not been fully understood. The *Moretum* was well known to Ovid, for in *Fast.* IV, 367-371 he practically repeats *Mor.* 99, and the very word *moretum* is quoted by the lexicons only from these two classical passages. The Ovidian character of the language is clearly, though by no means exhaustively, shown by K. v. Reichenbach, *Über die Echtheit des Moretum* (Znaim, 1883), pp. 5, 9-10. The *Copa*, which imitates the last book of Propertius, has been rightly referred to the years 16-15 B.C. by Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.* XLV (1890), 323, and by Mras, *Wien. Stud.* XXIII (1901), 252. It is probable that it is nearly contemporaneous with the Sulpicia elegies²⁴ and that it precedes the first edition of the *Amores*. The *Rosetum*, like all the other pieces of the collection, imitates the 'singers of Euphorion' (e.g. vs. 45). The grounds on which Naeke formerly attacked it (*op. cit.* 239), seem to me to be completely swept aside. While I still reserve final judgment, I am strongly disposed to recall this exquisite piece without question to the Appendix. The *Priapea* and the *Maecenas* — the latter composed in 8 B.C. — are the latest works contained in the Appendix. They differ from all the rest in certain metrical details, and show — the one usually, the other

²⁴ In these (IV, 2-6), as in the *Copa*, the early Ovidian *schema SDSS* predominates.

invariably — the Tibullan dissyllables in the pentameter close; in general they exhibit no longer a gradual development, but the full perfection of metrical art. It is clear that the Appendix, which was never intended for any except a very limited circulation, was arranged in its present form by Ovid after 8 B.C., and was made to include the *Maecenas*, which for this purpose was torn loose from its companion piece, the *Consolatio ad Liviam*. The statement of Ovid (*Maec.* 9) that he had no personal acquaintance with Maecenas is fully confirmed by the poet's received works, which never mention the Augustan statesman.

I have reserved to the last a brief mention of several poems of the *Catalepton*, which give autobiographical details.²⁵ The sequel of the Lygdamus-Neaera elegies and of Neaera's divorce and remarriage is given in three bitter and virulent pieces (vi, xii, xiii). It would seem that the fair Neaera, whose real name was Atilia, after separation from the poet, fell into the hands of a base spendthrift and debauchee, whose character is attacked with the utmost fury; for the identity of persons and of language here, compare especially xiii, 7, *prostitutae sororis*, and Lygd. 1, 26, *sive sibi coniunx sive futura soror*. The note of sincerity in the Lygdamus poems seems confirmed also when we read (vi, 4 f.): *et mihi . . . gener sacerque, perdidistis omnia*. The reference to sickness and a frail physique (xiii, 1 f.) agrees with Ovid's own statements (e.g. *Trist.* iv, 10, 37), while the allusion to military service (*ib.* 2 f.) is confirmed by the requirements of the *cursus honorum* and by the Ovidian *Vita* ('*militavit sub M. Varrone*').

There remain for brief mention only the four Vergilian 'impersonations,' 28 verses in all. The first and seventh poems are addressed to Tucca and Varius and cause us to wonder mildly that the jocose love affairs which they describe should have interested so deeply Vergil's executors and the editors.

²⁵ I purpose myself, at an early date, to publish a study of the language of at least the chief parts of the *Catalepton*.

of the *Aeneid*. The eighth speaks of the possibility of taking refuge (along with 'dad') in the villa of Siron, while the fourteenth²⁶ is a pleading prayer to Venus that the poet might be permitted to finish the *Aeneid* (which the actual writer knows perfectly well that he never finished). When we reflect that the *Catalepton* contains a direct parody of Catullus (x), consisting of 20 lines, and a lampoon of 40 lines (xiii) in the manner of Horace's *Epodes*, and further that the Tibullan Corpus contains three 'impersonations' of Tibullus, amounting in all to 226 lines—not to mention 214 lines of Sulpicia elegies, spoken by Sulpicia and the poet alternately, and 40 lines of letters of a most personal and intimate kind written by Sulpicia herself (!)—when, I repeat, we consider all these amazingly similar happenings and occasionally let our minds dwell too upon the twenty-one Epistles of the Heroines, we surely cannot be greatly at a loss how to interpret these four playful and harmless little effusions. There can be no doubt that the lost *Epigrammata* also contained a few Vergilian impersonations; one of these is probably still preserved in the shape of the series of epigrams on Ballista contained in the life of Vergil by Phocas (*Anth. Lat.* 671, 71-72. 76-83).

It is scarcely necessary for me to discuss the concluding epigram of the *Catalepton* (*Vate Syracosio*, etc.) which expressly asserts Vergilian authorship for some unnamed collection of verse, but whether this collection is the *Catalepton* roll alone,²⁷ or the whole Appendix in late codex form, it is impossible to say. Commentators are also greatly in doubt whether to hold that the epigram was added by the editor (Ellis, Birt), or by some late grammarian (Vollmer, Sommer). The problem is insoluble.

It is clear that we actually have in the present Appendix

²⁶ Almost invariably rejected by critics according to Vollmer, *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1907, p. 346, e.g., by Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.* xxxviii, 523 f., and by Sommer, *op. cit.* 68 f.

²⁷ In this first case the epigram may have been composed either (a) by Ovid himself in a spirit of mischief or (b) by some grammarian. We cannot tell.

the series of youthful works which Ovid assures us in the *Tristia* he had suppressed and destroyed, because he regarded them as 'faulty'; cf. *Trist.* IV, 10, 61 f.:

Multa quidem scripsi, sed quae vitiosa putavi,
Emendaturis ignibus ipse dedi.²⁸

Cf. also *ib.* I, 7, 15: haec (i.e., *Metamorphoses*) ego discedens, *sicut bene multa meorum*, | ipse mea posui maestus in igne manu. These statements cannot refer to his poems contributed to the Tibullan Corpus, which he knew would be preserved and read as long as the genuine works of Tibullus himself, but only to the pieces of the Vergilian Appendix. It is evident, however, that as in the case of the *Metamorphoses*, which he also sought to destroy, there were in this case too several additional copies in existence, and these latter, contrary to the poet's first intention, were preserved either in the principal booksellers' shops or in the archives of the great patrons. These transcripts, however, did not belong to a definite and permanent edition, but only to a tentative one, and they were issued anonymously.

The studies of Birt and Sommer upon the *Catalepton*, valuable as they are, contain also very grave mistakes; for they erroneously attribute many of these pieces to Vergil himself.²⁹ Yet both Birt and Sommer exercise discrimination and restraint and they both show a genuine regard for the work of their predecessors in the same field. A similar statement cannot be made, in my judgment, respecting Vollmer's article in the *Sitzungsberichte* already quoted above, which not only ascribes to Vergil the whole *Catalepton*, but all the other parts of the Appendix accepted by Donatus and Servius. Vollmer's method appears to me wholly to lack the critical faculty, and his article, in its total rejection of internal evidence and its almost total neglect of the work of

²⁸ "He wrote and destroyed many verses before he published anything," says S. G. Owen, *Ency. Brit.* II. xx, 386.

²⁹ Birt, *Catalepton*, 7, 95 f., rejects only *Cat.* ix; Sommer, *op. cit.* 31 ff., rejects only ix, xiii, xiv.

nearly all students of the Appendix, seems a most remarkable production to proceed from a learned scholar of the twentieth century.³⁰ Vollmer gives a thoroughly good account of the ancient and textual testimony — to which alone he attaches any value — and in his view (*op. cit.* 350) the evidence is sufficient to show that a corpus of Vergil's minor works was published immediately after his death. We do not share this view, yet we also recognize something unusual and remarkable in the text tradition, as it has been described by Vollmer and others. The actual circumstances of publication cannot be precisely known, but we may conjecture them to have been somewhat as follows. A carefully guarded and highly prized manuscript, without the name of its author, was preserved in the book-boxes of one of the chief publishers or — more probably — in the archives of one of the great literary patrons — Cotta, Messalinus, or Fabius Maximus. The rolls may have constituted an edition *de luxe*, or the place of their deposit may have indicated the high value of the manuscript; in any case it is likely that the work exhibited some mark of special honor, though it bore no title. The grammarians of the age of Tiberius opened these rolls with the most favorable prepossessions, recognizing from the first that they had in their possession the works of one of the chief Augustans, but not knowing whether the real author was Vergil, Varius, Valgus, Horace, Gallus, Propertius, or Ovid. When they reached, however, the four (or as they thought, the five) 'impersonations' of Vergil contained in the *Catalepton* (I, V, VII, VIII, XIV), their doubts were at an end and they believed that they held in their hands the juvenile poems of Vergil himself. It cannot be asserted definitely that they found the concluding epigram expressly asserting Vergilian authorship, but even this is perhaps possible. Elated with their discovery, they next examined more

³⁰ A whole section devoted to Vollmer's method has been omitted here for lack of space, and will be published elsewhere. It discusses also more fully the 'New Vergil' and the 'Cecropian Garden at Naples (?)'.

carefully the remaining rolls, and finding one addressed to 'worshipful Octavius,' 'the holy lad' (*Cul.* 25 f.), they cried out joyously — if we may employ the grandiloquent language of the later Carolingian editor — that they had found the youthful productions of "the wisest of poets, the fellow-disciple of Octavianus Caesar, the emperor of the world." Thus the fortune of the whole collection was definitely made, and the *Culex*, which was believed to show the close friendship existing between Vergil and the youthful Octavian, naturally remained the most famous piece of the entire Appendix. The *Aetna* was probably extant in a separate edition, which was either anonymous or published in the name of its true author, and it was therefore never fully accepted as Vergilian.

III. Extent of the Original Appendix. Servius' 'Seven Rolls.' The *Epigrammata*. The Great *Priapea*

The view which we take of the original form of the Appendix has already been clearly implied in the preceding discussion, but may be stated here more fully at a few points. Servius (*Vitae Verg.* p. 69 Brummer), after giving the distich on Ballista, tells us that Vergil wrote also seven or eight 'books' (*scripsit septem sive octo libros*) : *Ciris*, *Aetna*, *Culex*, *Priapeia*, *Catalepton* (*sic*), *Epigrammata*, *Copa*, *Dirae*. The same works are named (though in a different order) by Donatus (*ib.* 4), except that he mentions the *Aetna* as disputed and omits entirely the *Copa*. It is generally agreed today (Vollmer, *op. cit.* 342; Birt, *op. cit.* 8) that at the time of first publication these juvenile works were copied off — either entirely or for the most part — on separate papyrus rolls, which gave the title of each work, and the whole collection was preserved in a single *capsa*. Servius' account is derived from Suetonius, and it is evidently to this form of publication that Suetonius originally referred; we have therefore the problem of determining how the seven rolls were probably constituted. Later, after the parchment book had been introduced, the well-

known catalogue of the Murbach library, compiled about 850, makes mention of a Vergilian codex, now lost, which contained *Dirae*, *Culex*, *Aetna*, *Copa*, *Maecenas*, *Ciris*, *Catalepius* (*sic*), *Priapeia*, *Moretum*, but from which the *Epigrammata* had already disappeared. Finally, after the full Appendix had broken up into several parts, a special collection, the so-called *Iuvenalis ludi libellus*,³¹ was brought together in Carolingian times, containing *Versus Ovidii Nasonis*, *Culex*, *Dirae*, *Copa*, the two Ausonian pieces, *Est et non* and *Vir bonus*, *Rosetum*, *Moretum*, often also *Versus Octaviani Augusti* (*Ergone supremis*, etc.),³² and *Carmen tetrasticon Ovidii Nasonis*. The Bruxellensis has also preserved the single iambic Priapeum (sometimes attributed to Tibullus), *Quid hoc novi est*, and the Cuiacianus of Tibullus apparently had, with ascription to Vergil (Schanz, *op. cit.* §278, p. 220), the short Priapeum in three distichs, *Vilicus aerari quondam*.

By no means all of the *Epigrammata* have been permanently lost, but some have been preserved in the anthology of the codex Salmasianus, and less completely also in the enlarged form of the Donatus *Vita* and in Parisini 8069, 8093, 8071, etc.³³ These are the well-known verselets *Nocte pluit tota*, *Hos ego versiculos*, *Pars tibi Nise datur*, *Arretine calix*, *Monte sub hoc lapidum*, *Si quotiens peccant*, etc. (*Anth. Lat.* 256–263). Possibly we should add to these such pieces also as *Anth.*

³¹ Vollmer, *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1908, 1–82; Sommer, *op. cit.* 7; Baehrens, *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.* cxi (1875), 137 ff.

³² Whether this famous 'impersonation' of Augustus, in which he is represented as forbidding the destruction of the *Aeneid* (*Anth. Lat.* 645), at least in the much simpler and better version in which the last twelve lines have been preserved in the admirable Vossianus fol. 111 (*Nescio quid fugiente*, *Anth. Lat.* 655, and II, p. 147), may possibly also have belonged to the Appendix from the first, is a question which I shall not here discuss and which probably cannot be determined. Baehrens, *op. cit.* 138, gives good grounds for regarding the verses as a very late addition.

³³ This is the view held — correctly, as I think — by Naeke, *op. cit.* 226, 235; Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 3; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 36; Riese, *Anth. Lat.* 1¹ (1869), xxix; L. Müller, *Praef. Priap.* xli (in his edition of Catullus); Leo, *Culex*, p. 18. Vollmer, *Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1907, p. 340, is wrong in thinking that none have been preserved.

Lat. 663, 674^a (*Maeonium quisquis*), 778, 812 (*Parce puer*), 813 (*Iuppiter in caelis*), and the like.³⁴ In no sense then do we accept the forced and unnatural explanation of the *Epigrammata* as the same as the *Catalepton* that has been urged in recent years, but we wish a large collection of verselets that will themselves constitute a roll, and upon which the authors of the Vergilian *Vitae* and the compilers of the Salmasian codex may have freely drawn. Specifically we have overwhelming proof for including among the *Epigrammata* verses referring evidently to another part of the Appendix,³⁵ the epigram afterwards unwittingly repeated by its author in *Trist.* II, 33 f.,³⁶ probably the two epigrams whose Ovidian parallels were long ago pointed out by Comparetti and Riese,³⁷ and finally the elegiac quatrain preserved only in inferior manuscripts³⁸ but cleverly shown by Rand, *op. cit.* 141, to be taken from 'a page that came after the epilogue to the *Catalepton*,' i.e., from a page of the *Epigrammata*.

We are now prepared to indicate the original form of the Appendix and to reconstitute the seven books named by Servius. We may first mention, however, a fatal error which has long injuriously affected the criticism of the collection. Scholars have usually tended strongly to hold that the poems which are not expressly mentioned by Suetonius (that is, by

³⁴ Cf. Naeke, *op. cit.* 236. Possibly also *Mantua me genuit, Ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena*.

³⁵ No. 258: *Pars tibi, Nise, datur Bacchi, pars deinde negatur: | Esse potes liber, non potes esse pater*, 'You can be free as a bird of air, but you are no longer a father.' The piece has most Ovid-like punning, and though Nisus, through his transformation into a bird, loses his daughter, he becomes of course 'free'; cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 116: *liber captivos avis ferae consimilis est*. Cf. also *Cir.* 191 f.: *Nise pater . . . tu quoque avis moriere*; *Met.* VIII, 126: *exige poenas, Nise pater*; *ib.* 231 and *A. A.* II, 93: *At pater infelix, nec iam pater*, 'Icare,' dixit.

³⁶ No. 262: *Si quotiens peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat | Iuppiter, exiguo tempore inermis erit*.

³⁷ On *Maeonium quisquis* (674^a), see Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, Eng. trans., p. 153, n. 57; on *Iuppiter in caelis* (813), see Riese, *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.* 1869, p. 282.

³⁸ *Cat.* XIII^a (Ellis), XVI (Birt); cf. Sommer, p. 5.

Donatus and Servius) did not then form part of the Appendix, but were added at a later time by mistake and by a process of slow accretion to the original nucleus.³⁹ This current view, which finds no support whatever in the text tradition, seems to me wholly erroneous, and it greatly obscures the true nature of the Appendix. On the contrary, it is probable that, with the exception of the loss of the *Epigrammata* and the addition of the two Ausonian pieces (*Est et non*, *Vir bonus*), the collection exists today⁴⁰ in nearly the same state as when it was first published in the age of Tiberius. Servius evidently could not mention as Vergilian the *Maecenas*, which was written eleven years after Vergil's death and which he doubtless supposed to be a later addition.⁴¹ Also the *Copa* is not mentioned by Donatus, and the *Moretum* and *Rosetum* are mentioned neither by Donatus nor Servius for the reason, in my judgment, that the three or four smaller pieces were written together on one roll, which bore the title of its first piece, the *Dirae*.⁴² The seven Vergilian 'books' of Servius, with the number of verses in each, were then probably as follows: (1) *Culex* (414); (2) *Dirae*, *Copa*, *Moretum*, *Rosetum* (393);⁴³

³⁹ Thus Vollmer, *op. cit.* 341, 356, holds that the *Moretum*, *Lydia*, *Aetna*, and *Maecenas* were added after Vergil's death, yet in the first century A.D., but that they do not appear in Suetonius' list, because they first crept into a private copy(!).

⁴⁰ For example, following the procedure of the Renaissance editors and assembling all the minor works which reputable manuscripts attribute to Vergil, Vollmer has the full Appendix, with the exception of (1) the *Priapea*, (2) the *Epigrammata* which have been preserved, (3) the *Rosetum*.

⁴¹ The *Maecenas* is not so much a spurious Vergilian as a genuine Ovidian work. As is well known, it professes to be by the same author as the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, which is also genuine.

⁴² Therefore, strictly speaking, Servius is in error, when in his list he mentions both the *Dirae* and the *Copa*, and it is probably owing to this error that he mentions 'seven or eight' books; cf. Schanz § 235, p. 85. It would be possible also to hold that the *Moretum* and *Copa*, like the *Aetna*, were in circulation in other editions, perhaps bearing the name of their true author, and therefore they could not be accepted by Suetonius as Vergilian, but we greatly prefer the view given above.

⁴³ The iambic *Priapeum*, *Quid hoc novi est* (45), may have stood either in the *Dirae* roll, or in the *Epigrammata*, or at the end of the great *Priapea*.

(3) *Ciris* (541); (4) *Aetna* (641); (5) *Catalepton* (286); (6) *Epigrammata* (uncertain); (7) *Priapea* (565). The *Maece-nas* may either have been added to one of the other rolls (e.g. the *Catalepton*), or it may have formed an eighth 'book'; the former is more likely.

We reach at last the great *Priapea*,⁴⁴ one of the seven main divisions of the Appendix, which is attested as such by Donatus, by Servius, and by the ninth century Murbach catalogue, and which, as is well known, is ascribed in nearly all the manuscripts to Vergil,⁴⁵ and receives its proper place in nearly all the early editions of the Vergilian opuscula. It might be supposed therefore that, except for investigating its language and meter, our task was finished. This is far, however, from being actually the case. For brilliant and elegant as the *Priapea* is in so many respects, it is yet, owing to its licentious character, the one disreputable member, the one 'black sheep' of the Appendix family, and its room has usually been much more desired than its company. Its text has had therefore a checkered and eventful history, since

⁴⁴ Wernicke's treatise (*Priapeia*, I, Thorn, 1853) has not been accessible to me any more than it was to Buecheler, nor have I been able to procure Calì, *Studi su i Priapea*, Catania, 1894. With these exceptions, I have used all the important literature, including of course the edition (with *notae variorum*) by P. Burman in his *Anth. Lat.*, lib. VI, Amsterdam, 1773, and the catalogue of editions of Vergil in Naeke, *op. cit.* 379-422.

⁴⁵ Cf. L. Müller, *Praef. Priap. XLIV*: Longissime a vero aberrarunt, qui statuerent, ad tria tantum Priapea . . . pertinere Donati testimonium, quippe et codicum plerique omnes constanter totam syllogen tribuunt Maroni; Buecheler, *Rh. Mus. XVIII* (1863), 382: Hunc Priapeorum librum ideo codices P. Vergilio Maroni adtribuunt quod catalectis Vergilianis cohaerebat antiquitus. itaque in vita Vergilii Donatus 'catalepton et priapia' inter opera illius poetica numeravit; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* I, 55 f.: codices novicii saec. xv plerumque praescribunt 'P. Virgilii Maronis Priapeia' similiave. Alone of all the editors, Baehrens (*P.L.M.* I, 54; II, 33; *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.* cxi, 140, n. 5) wholly minimizes the value of the ascription to Vergil in the manuscripts. He does this on the wholly insufficient ground that the date which he assumes for the publication of the Appendix in the age of Claudius conflicts with the elder Seneca's quotation from the *Priapea*. Teuffel (§ 254, 5) and Schanz (§ 320) do not even mention the usual ascription, but only the corrected title in Laur. 33, 31, *Diversorum auctorum Priapeia*!

not unnaturally the ascription of so considerable a body of ribald poems to Vergil aroused in some of the medieval copyists and still more in the great Renaissance scholars an invincible repugnance. Like the *Aetna*, the *Ciris*, and the *Catalepton*, but for a very different reason,⁴⁶ it has been torn loose from the principal part of the Appendix in nearly all manuscripts.⁴⁷ One or two manuscripts, such as the well-known Laur. 33, 31 (saec. XIV), give a corrected title *Diversorum auctorum Priapeia*, while a few simply erase the Vergilian ascription either in whole or in part (Baehrens, *P.L.M.* I, 57; Naeke, 240). From such causes as these many erroneous views have arisen among scholars respecting the *Priapea*; all of them, however, without exception, are such as admit of being easily dissipated by a historical review.

We may first dispose of an erroneous view which is comparatively recent, but which has been widely held in certain quarters. For four hundred years editors of Vergil apparently did not question that the great *Priapea* is the collection ascribed by Donatus and Servius to Vergil, though they almost invariably held that the ascription was a wholly mistaken one. This is still the view of Naeke, *op. cit.* (1847) 240 f., who excludes the *Priapea* — like the *Aetna*, the *Ciris*, and the 'Catalecta' — from the *Iuvenalis ludi libellus*, but not from the Appendix.⁴⁸ After Naeke's time, however, a new explanation was brought forward, especially favored perhaps by Baehrens and by Sabbadini. This view, which is well set forth by Sommer, *op. cit.* 35, and by Birt, *op. cit.* 3, professes to proceed from Donatus' statement (Brummer, p. 4):

⁴⁶ 'Non recepta . . . propter obscenitatem' (Naeke, *op. cit.* 225).

⁴⁷ Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 8, Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 30, and Naeke, *op. cit.* 225, 337, 345, mention three fifteenth century manuscripts in which the *Priapea* is joined to the other opuscula, namely, to Vossianus L. O. 81, Parisinus 8205, and Mediceus plut. xxxiii, 31. The *Aetna* also joins the other works only in a few manuscripts and joins the *Libellus* only in two.

⁴⁸ At the same time he well says: "Nihil in Priapeis Vergilianum, nedum Catullianum; aetatem Ovidii, vel supparem Ovidio, concedo . . . plerisque carminibus."

Deinde (fecit) Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem, etc. It assumes, however, that Suetonius originally wrote *Catalepton (et Priapea et Epigrammata)*⁴⁹ and that Donatus has made a mistake in interpreting him. Likewise Servius has made a mistake in naming seven rolls and in changing the order freely thus: *septem sive octo libros . . . Priapeia Catalepton Epigrammata.* (Likewise, we may add, the Murbach catalogue has made a mistake in its order, *Catalepton Priapeia*, for the three poems on Priapus in the *Catalepton* stand first, not last.) By thus assuming in a most forced and unnatural manner that Donatus' *et* has the meaning of *id est* or *scilicet*, sorely harassed and perplexed editors have sought to show that the terms *Priapea* and *Epigrammata* in the ancient account indicate only subdivisions or component parts of the *Catalepton* and have no independent meaning whatsoever. Hence, since the *Catalepton* happens to begin with three poems — of forty-six lines in all — relating to Priapus, which form of course a part of the *Catalepton* roll and are included under the *Catalepton* title, the proposal is made to remove the three poems in question from the *Catalepton*, to introduce a new and special title of '*Priapea*,' and so to obviate all need of recognizing the disreputable member of the collection, the great *Priapea*.

In practice, however, the editors of the text, in view of the lack of the least vestige of manuscript authority for such a change, proceed rather cautiously. Thus Ribbeck continues to include the three Priapean poems under the '*Catalecta*,' Ellis creates a hybrid title '*Catalepton (Priapea)*,' whatever this may mean, and writing in his preface (p. ix) *Ciris Priapea Catalepton* instead of the correct *Ciris Catalepton*, he conscientiously adds an expression of doubt in a footnote.⁵⁰ Voll-

⁴⁹ Certainly Ribbeck's guess (*App. Verg.* 3) is just as good or even better than this, namely, that Donatus 'perhaps' meant 'catalepton libros tres, priapea scilicet et epigrammata et diras.'

⁵⁰ "Si modo tria illa carmina ad Priapum praefixa Cataleptis aut eadem aut inter ea quae Servio ac Donato Priapeorum nomine innotuerant." Schanz also is cautious here (§ 235, p. 85): "Perhaps we may go a step further and

mer rashly introduces the new titles ‘*Priapea*’ and ‘*Catalepton*,’ and arbitrarily assumes in his edition (pp. 127 and 130) that the title *Catalepton*, originally standing before the supposed second part of the collection, ‘casu migravit ante *Priapea*'; Baehrens also (*P.L.M.* II, 58) has the title ‘*Priapea*.' Birt has only the title *Catalepton* and says expressly (p. 2): “We have no reason and no right to transpose the title *Catalepton* which precedes the (three) *Priapea* and to place it, as Ellis does, after III^a.” As we read further, however, we find that he holds (contrary to Donatus, Servius, and the Murbach catalogue) that there never was in the Appendix any separate heading, title, or book such as *Priapea*. He had defended the title; he should have defended both the title and the fact which is implied in the title. We are indebted to Birt, however, for the clear settlement of one important question. L. Müller (*op. cit.* XLIV ff.) had correctly maintained that the great *Priapea* was a part of the Appendix, but he had also supposed that our three separate poems did not originally stand in the manuscripts of the Appendix at the head of the *Catalepton*, but at the very end of the *Priapea*, thus forming nos. 83–85 of the complete collection. Birt, *op. cit.* 45 f., and Sommer, *op. cit.* 96, have shown, however, that the last assumption is an impossible one. For the three Priapean poems of the *Catalepton* follow the Catullan metric and very freely allow the basis or first foot of the Glyconic and the Pherecratic to consist of a trochee, while the Phalaeceans of the great *Priapea* (with the single exception of *dicans*, 4, 2) rigorously observe the Horatian rule that the basis shall always be a spondee. It is evident therefore that the three poems in question were composed several years in advance of the great *Priapea* and have belonged from the first to the *Catalepton*.

We return to the history of the collection. It is well known that the younger Pliny, *Ep.* v, 3, 2 ff., speaks of Vergil as being, include the *Priapea* under the *Catalepton*.” Teuffel-Schwabe and Teuffel-Kroll (§ 230, 5, 2), however, are rash in the extreme.

in a preëminent degree, a writer of unchaste verses: *Facio nonnumquam versiculos severos parum . . . inter quos (sc. auctores) vel praecipue numerandus est P. Vergilius, Cornelius Nepos, etc.* We cannot doubt therefore that at the date when this letter was written (105 A.D.) not merely the two objectionable poems of the *Catalepton* (II^a, XIII), but also the whole licentious corpus of the *Priapea* lay before him, and was accepted by him as Vergilian, just as shortly before the *Culex* had been accepted by Lucan, Statius, and Martial. In the ninth century also, as is shown by the Murbach catalogue, the *Priapea* was still a part of the Appendix. Shortly afterwards, the Appendix was broken up, as we know, into many different parts.⁵¹ On account of its ribald character, the *Priapea* was now usually separated from all the other pieces, and was less frequently copied by the monks than any other part, hence all our manuscripts are very late; in a few cases also, as in Laur. 33, 31, the title was corrected to *Divisorum auctorum Priapea* or some similar designation.

The attitude of the Renaissance scholars towards the *Priapea* may best be illustrated from the procedure adopted by Giovanni Andrea, the brilliant editor of the *princeps* (1469). As Naeke has shown (p. 379), it was originally his intention to include the *Priapea* in the edition as a whole, and he wrote therefore in the dedicatory epistle as follows: *Priapeiam illam quidem . . . non inelegantem esse fateor. Sed an optimi et modestissimi sit Vatis, quoniam nonnulli ambigunt, nequaquam asseruerim.* At the last moment, however, it was thought best to include the indecorous collection in only a part of the copies issued, and to omit it from another part. A similar compromise was effected in the title adopted, namely, *Lusus poetarum in Priapum*. Subsequent editions

⁵¹ At least six, namely (1) the *Libellus*, (2) *Aetna*, (3) *Moretum*, (4) *Ciris* and *Catalepton*, (5) *Maecenas*, (6) *Priapea*. For the sake of brevity it is often said (e.g., by Ribbeck, *App. Verg.* 24; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* II, 6; Ellis, *Praef.* IX; Sommer, *Cat.* 4) that the Appendix broke up into two (main) parts, but this statement is of course not wholly accurate; cf. Vollmer, *P.L.M.* I², 4: "collectio in varias partes discepta est."

of the fifteenth century include the *Priapea*, but usually without ascription, *i.e.*, they give the title simply as *Priapea*.⁵² The Aldine edition of the *Carmina Minora* of 1517 includes the *Priapea*, but under the vulgate title *Diversorum veterum poetarum in Priapum lusus*. The Preface of Burman (*Anth. Lat.* II, 475–478) shows clearly how purely conventional and traditional this title is. The Renaissance scholars were naturally greatly averse to attributing the whole collection to Vergil, but they readily acquiesced in the ascription *diversorum auctorum (poetarum)*, with the purpose (as they declared) that the more innocent poems might be referred to Vergil, the remainder to Tibullus, Ovid, Petronius, and Martial.⁵³

A curious result of the compromise that, for very practical reasons, was effected in the Renaissance four centuries ago, has come down to our own times. For even the learned editors, like Buecheler and L. Müller, whose judgments upon the *Priapea* are usually so just, are strangely misled at this point by conventions and traditions of long standing. Thus Müller, *op. cit.* XLIV, declares that "even a child can recognize that the *Priapea* contain the work of many authors," and a similar opinion is expressed by Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.* XVIII, 383. Hence all modern critics speak constantly of the elegant connoisseur who 'compiled,' 'collected' or 'copied off' these poems from the walls of the shrines of Priapus.⁵⁴ The actual

⁵² *Veneta Achat.* (1473) and *Romana* (1473) have, however, *P.V.M. Priapea*, *(Naeke, 387 f.), while *Ascensiana* I (1500) and *Virgilius Aldinus* (1501) exclude both the *Priapea* and the 'Catalecta' (Naeke, 411).

⁵³ For similar reasons they attribute the two longer *Priapea* of the *Catalepton* (nos. 84 and 85 Müller) to Catullus. It was Scaliger who finally protested most earnestly against attributing the *Priapea* to Vergil (Burman, p. 478).

⁵⁴ Cf. Buecheler, p. 382, 'qui collegit'; Müller, p. XIII, 'collegit *Priapea*'; Baehrens, *P.L.M.* I, 54, 'parietibus sacelli Priapo dedicati . . . ea collegit lepidus quidam'; Teuffel-Schwabe, § 25, 4, 5, 'poems which the editor had gleaned (Teuffel-Kroll, 'zusammengelesen hatte') from literature (3 is from Ovid), and especially from the walls of the shrines of Priapus, and himself revised'; Carter, *Elegiac Poets*, XLIV, 'made a collection of the poems, copying them from the walls, etc.'

language of the second preface (2, 9 ff.) is, however, something quite different :

Ergo, quidquid id est, quod otiosus
Templi parietibus tui *notavi*,
In partem accipias bonam, rogamus,

'I beg you humbly, Priapus, to excuse these verses that in my idle hours I have scribbled upon the walls of your temple.'⁵⁵ Actually of course we know that our poet wrote the *Priapea*, which is full of recondite literary allusions, in his study, with many volumes of Homer (68), Callimachus (12, 3; 16, 5), Eratosthenes (62, 2), Leonidas (24), Elephantis (4, 2), Philaenis (63, 17) and other learned authors gathered about him, but he is clever enough to use the custom of writing jocose verses upon the walls of Priapus' shrine as a pretext or excuse for his indecorous volume. The somewhat transparent literary device which he employs consists then in saying that he has just accidentally scribbled his own light verses at random on the plaster walls—transferring them of course later to his tablets with the help of an exceptionally good memory; there is no thought or faintest suggestion, however, that he has ever scribbled off, copied off, or collected the verses of any other person or persons whatsoever.

In the foregoing discussion we have determined the relation of the *Priapea* to the Vergilian Appendix, which we consider of fundamental and vital importance, but which has been neglected in all studies of the Appendix made subsequent to L. Müller's edition of the *Priapea* (Leipzig, 1870). We have shown also, contrary to the wholly unwarranted assumptions which most editors and scholars have made ever since the curious but necessary compromise effected in the early Renaissance, that the second preface implies not diversity but unity of

⁵⁵ *Notavi* is not 'collected from,' 'copied off from,' but 'marked, scratched, written (*scripsi*),' just as in the *Praefatio* to the metrical arguments, vs. 5: *argumenta quidem librorum prima notavi*, and often elsewhere in Ovid, as *Her.* 1, 62; III, 2; v, 22; *Met.* IX, 523 f. etc. Cf. Burman *ad loc.*: '*notare* hic est inscribere,' and Rand, *op. cit.* 129: 'They are scribbled on the walls of the god's rustic shrine (2, 9 f.)'

authorship for the entire *Priapea*. If, however, there is a single author for these poems, there can be no question of his identity. For the elder Seneca, *Contr.* I, 2, 22, tells us that, at a certain *controversia* or declamation at which he was present in the schools of rhetoric, one of the speakers gave a ribald turn to the argument. Instantly the distinguished orator and poet Mamercus Scaurus,⁵⁶ who was as witty as he was dissolute, completely disconcerted him by quoting *Ovidianum illud*, 'inepta loci.' The reference is to *Priap.* 3, 7 f.: Quod virgo prima cupido dat nocte marito, | dum timet alterius volnus inepta loci. I may add that the natural assumption is that Seneca's attestation of Ovidian authorship applies to the whole book. For attestation is not required for each single piece any more than it would be necessary for each single poem in Book I of Horace's *Odes*, and Naeke, *op. cit.* 221, is quite right in insisting earnestly that when Quintilian, VIII, 3, 28, accepted one poem (II^b) of the *Catalepton* as Vergilian, he accepted all.⁵⁷

The astounding language of the two prefaces, the diction and *schemata* of all the poems, the unity of the refined metrical art revealed by innumerable details confirm at every point the conclusions which we have just reached through our study of the Appendix. We reserve, however, the treatment of the two prefaces and of the metrical art for a brief article to be published elsewhere.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ On Scaurus, see Teuffel, § 276, 2; he was driven by Tiberius to suicide in 34 A.D. (Tac. *Ann.* VI, 29). The *controversia* mentioned apparently took place in the last ten or fifteen years of Augustus' reign. Scaurus was accustomed to quote Ovid very frequently and apparently knew his works almost by heart (*Contr.* IX, 5, 17); in view of the character of his life and his high nobility, it is possible that he was a friend and dissolute associate of Cotta. He may have known the *Priapea* from oral recitation, or from a separate edition, or even — it must be freely admitted — from a complete edition of the Appendix, which in that case was never wholly suppressed. We can only conclude from the passage in question that the real author of the *Priapea* was known both to Scaurus under Augustus and to Seneca under Tiberius.

⁵⁷ Vollmer also (*Sitzb. bayer. Akad.* 1907, p. 344, n. 1) accepts this principle and quotes Naeke's statement of it with warm approval.

⁵⁸ Probably in *Classical Philology*. The article is already completed.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

HELD AT ANN ARBOR, MICH., DECEMBER, 1921

ALSO OF THE TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

Philological Association of the Pacific Coast

HELD AT SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., NOVEMBER, 1921

VOLUME LII

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY

ADELBERT COLLEGE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

I. PROGRAMME

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28

FIRST SESSION, 2.30 O'CLOCK P.M.

HELEN H. LAW

The Entrance Technique of Plautus¹

A. E. R. BOAK

Two Contracts for a Division of Property, from
Graeco-Roman Egypt (p. 81)

JOHN W. TAYLOR

Was Theodore Gaza Really a Philosopher?²

C. W. E. MILLER

A Contribution to the History of the Tenses in Greek³

R. H. TANNER

Callias, the Husband of Elpinice⁴

W. A. OLDFATHER

Richard Bentley's Critical Notes on Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus* (read by title, p. 41)

R. B. STEELE

The Interest in Vergil, Roman and Modern (read by title, p. xix)

FLORENCE M. B. ANDERSON

The Metrical Arrangement of the κομμός in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus (read by title)⁵

¹ From a chapter in *Studies in the Songs of Plautus*, doctoral dissertation of Chicago University, Menasha, Wis., 1922: George Banta Publishing Co.

² To be embodied in an edition of Theodore Gaza's *de Fato*, to appear shortly.

³ To be published in the *American Journal of Philology*, XLIII (1922).

⁴ To be published in *Classical Philology*, XVII (1922).

⁵ To be published in the *American Journal of Philology*.

JOINT SESSION WITH THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL
INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL

New Life out of Italy and Greece: Annual Address of the
President of the Association

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 29

SECOND SESSION, 9.30 O'CLOCK A.M.

FLORENCE M. B. ANDERSON

A Suggested Emendation of Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 1459¹

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON

Concerning the "Frammenti di una commedia di Menandro"
(p. 69)

E. K. RAND

A *Vade Mecum* of Liberal Culture in a Manuscript of Fleury²

CAMPBELL BONNER

A Papyrus of the University of Michigan Describing Magical
Powers (p. 111)

SUSAN H. BALLOU

The *Carrière* of the Higher Officials in Egypt in the Second
Century (p. 96)

ANDREW R. ANDERSON

The Latin Epigrams of Holberg

FRANCIS W. KELSEY

An Epigraphic Forgery (read by title, p. xvii)

WILLIAM N. BATES

Notes on the *Choephoroi*³¹ To be published in the *American Journal of Philology*.² To be published in the *Philological Quarterly*, 1 (1922).³ This paper discussed half a dozen disputed passages, and proposed new
readings or interpretations.

WALTER PETERSEN

The Speaker and the Hearer (read by title, p. 16)

SECOND JOINT SESSION WITH THE
INSTITUTE

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

M. S. SLAUGHTER

The Study of Virgil¹

CARL D. BUCK

Greek *ἀμφοδον*, Oscan *amvianud*, and the Pompeian *etituns*-
inscriptions²

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 30

THIRD SESSION, 9.30 O'CLOCK A.M.

C. W. MENDELL

Literary Reminiscences in the *Agricola* (p. 53)

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

Crinagoras and his Epigrams (p. xviii)

WALTER MILLER

Thericles, Potter (read by title, p. 119)

ROBERT S. RADFORD

Ovidian Authorship of the *Priapea* (read by title, p. 148)

DEAN P. LOCKWOOD

A Four-Year Course in Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Latin
(read by title)³

E. H. STURTEVANT

The Character of the Latin Accent (read by title, p. 5)

¹ To be embodied in a larger study on Virgil.

² Published in *Classical Philology*, xvii (1922), 111-118.

³ To be published in the *Classical Journal*.

FOURTH SESSION, 2.30 O'CLOCK P.M.

A. L. KEITH

Vergil's Conception of Fate

A. L. FROTHINGHAM

Astrology and the Symbols and Standards of the Roman Legions

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

The Function of the Homeric Simile (p. 132)

DEAN P. LOCKWOOD

Post-Mortem Wit in Folk Tale, Literature, and Roman Law (p. xvii)

DAVID M. ROBINSON

Sappho and Her Influence on Later Literature¹

HENRY S. GEHMAN

A Translation of the *Peta-Vatthu*, Book III (read by title)

¹ To be embodied in a book entitled *Sappho* in the series "Our Debt to Greece and Rome."

II. MINUTES

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

FIRST SESSION

Wednesday afternoon, December 28, 1921.

The Fifty-third Annual Meeting was called to order by the President of the Association, Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, of the University of Pennsylvania, in the Auditorium of the Natural Science Building, University of Michigan. The session was attended by 50 people.

The Secretary, Professor Clarence P. Bill, of Western Reserve University, reported as follows:

The campaign for an endowment fund, begun by the Endowment Committee early in the year 1921, has resulted up to the present time in subscriptions amounting to about \$8600.

In accordance with action taken at the last annual meeting the Association joined in the Anglo-American General Meeting held by the Classical Association of England and Wales at Cambridge, England, August 2-5, 1921. Three papers were presented by members of our Association. A detailed account of the meeting will be published in the *Proceedings* of the Association of England and Wales.

The publication of *Transactions and Proceedings*, Volume LI, was delayed by a five months' strike of printers, and will not take place until January, 1922.

The Association has 806 members, distributed as follows:

Regular annual members	648
From the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	65
Life members	73
Relieved from payment of dues because of age and length of membership	
	20
	<u>806</u>

The membership record for the past year is as follows:

New members	157
Reinstated	8
Transferred from the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	1
Gain in members from the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	10
Total gain	<u>176</u>

Members lost

By death	12
By resignation	9
Dropped for failure in payment of dues	<u>5</u>

Total loss	26
Total net gain	150

The new members elected by the Executive Committee during the year are as follows:

Miss Edith Adams, Wellesley, Mass.
 Dean Francis A. Alabaster, Nebraska Wesleyan University.
 Bernard M. Allen, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Miss Jessie E. Allen, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Prof. Clara J. Allison, Michigan State Normal School.
 G. A. Armour, Princeton, N. J.
 Prof. Mary E. Armstrong, Olivet College.
 Prof. James C. Austin, Colgate University.
 Pres. Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College.
 Miss Edith Bancroft, Reading, Mass.
 Dr. Harold Bennett, College of Charleston.
 Capt. Paul Benrimo, Asheville, N. C.
 Prof. William Benson, Coe College.
 Miss Emma L. Berry, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Mrs. Mary L. H. Black, Panora, Ia.
 Dr. G. Alder Blumer, Providence, R. I.
 M. J. Boyer, Allentown, Pa.
 Miss Florence C. Brachman, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Miss M. Gertrude Bricker, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Dr. Blanche M. E. Brotherton, Wheaton College, Norton, Mass.
 Dr. W. Norman Brown, Johns Hopkins University.
 Dr. W. R. Bryan, American Academy, Rome, Italy.
 Dr. A. A. Bryant, New York City.
 Frank S. Bunnell, Norwich, Conn.
 Dr. Mary C. Burchinall, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Prof. Edmund Burke, College of the City of New York.
 Prof. Robert B. Burke, University of Pennsylvania.
 Miss Hilda Buttenwieser, University of Cincinnati.
 Miss Alice H. Byrne, Western College.
 Sister Marie J. Byrne, Convent, N. J.
 Miss Helen Campion, Denver, Colo.
 Prof. Howard V. Canter, University of Illinois.
 Miss Anna L. Carlin, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Arthur S. Chenoweth, Somers Point, N. J.
 Dr. Ethel L. Chubb, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Pres. William W. Comfort, Haverford College.
 Miss Ruth Congdon, New Bedford, Mass.
 Prof. Elisha Conover, Delaware College.
 Miss Jean V. N. Da Costa, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Dr. F. S. Darrow, Rochester, N. Y.
 Prof. E. W. Davis, Maryville College.

Prof. M. E. Davis, Howard Payne College.
Dr. Alice A. Deckman, Philadelphia, Pa.
Holmes V. M. Dennis, Princeton University.
Miss Eva Dilks, Philadelphia, Pa.
William B. Dinsmoor, Columbia University.
Miss Juanita M. Downes, Elkins Park, Pa.
Prof. James E. Dunlap, Indiana University.
Dr. George V. Edwards, College of the City of New York.
Willis A. Ellis, Lombard, Ill.
Mrs. Ellinor T. B. Endicott, New York City.
Miss Catherine A. Everett, Philadelphia, Pa.
William W. Farnam, New Haven, Conn.
Miss Elizabeth Faulkner, Chicago, Ill.
Frederick P. Fish, Boston, Mass.
Dr. Emily Foulkrod, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. J. E. Frame, Union Theological Seminary.
Miss A. Mildred Franklin, Wilson College.
Miss Ernestine P. Franklin, Williams Bridge, N. Y.
Ginn and Company, Boston, Mass.
Harold H. Glenn, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. A. E. Gobble, Albright College.
Prof. Grace G. Goodrich, Ripon College.
Dr. Mary A. Grant, University of Kansas.
Prof. William R. Grey, Davidson College.
Prof. Joseph B. Haley, Randolph-Macon College.
Miss Alice B. Hammond, New Haven, Conn.
Ralph W. Harbison, Pittsburgh, Pa.
William A. Harbison, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Dr. J. P. Harland, University of Michigan.
Dr. Lewis R. Harley, Philadelphia, Pa.
George McL. Harper, Princeton University.
Miss Helen F. Hill, Lowell, Mass.
James Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. John E. Hollingsworth, Washburn College.
Benjamin C. Holtzclaw, Cornell University.
Prof. Joseph H. Howard, University of South Dakota.
Miss M. Agnes Hutchinson, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Mark E. Hutchinson, Emory and Henry College.
Prof. Thomas A. Jenkins, University of Chicago.
Miss Ruth E. Keller, Columbus, O.
J. A. Kerns, Whitman College.
Prof. William E. Kirk, Willamette University.
Miss Lillian B. Lawler, State University of Iowa.
Miss Mary S. Lee, Philadelphia, Pa.
Miss Sylvia Lee, Boston, Mass.
Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Nahant, Mass.
Rev. William Ludwig, Wagner College.

Dr. F. B. Lund, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. Ida K. McFarlane, University of Denver.
Mrs. Isabella T. Machan, Decatur, Ill.
Dr. Robert C. MacMahon, New York City.
Paul Mayo, University of Denver.
Prof. Thomas Means, Bowdoin College.
Prof. Bruno Meineke, Hope College.
Eugene Meyer, Jr., New York City.
B. W. Mitchell, Philadelphia, Pa.
Samuel L. Mohler, University of Pennsylvania.
Nicholas Moseley, New Haven, Conn.
Prof. Omer Hillman Mott, Belmont Abbey, Belmont, N. C.
Walter N. Myers, Sellersville, Pa.
Dean Marian E. Park, Radcliffe College.
Thomas Patterson, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Harry F. Payer, Cleveland, O.
Dr. Adolf F. Pauli, University of Michigan.
Dr. Joseph Pearl, College of the City of New York.
Provost Joseph H. Penniman, University of Pennsylvania.
Albert S. Perkins, Dorchester, Mass.
Miss Marion V. Perry, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Annie M. Pitman, University of Wisconsin.
Alfred E. Porter, New Haven, Conn.
L. Arnold Post, Haverford College.
Dr. Helen Price, Hood College.
Dr. Lester M. Prindle, University of Vermont.
Dr. G. Payn Quackenbos, College of the City of New York.
Mrs. Eliza G. Radeke, Providence, R. I.
Miss Ruth E. Razee, New Haven, Conn.
Miss Edith F. Rice, Philadelphia, Pa.
Alfred L. Ripley, Andover, Mass.
Miss Dorothy M. Robathan, Clark's Green, Pa.
Harley F. Roberts, Watertown, Conn.
Harold C. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. Rodney P. Robinson, University of Cincinnati.
Miss Dorothy M. Roehm, Detroit, Mich.
Robert S. Rogers, Madison, N. J.
Prof. A. M. Rovelstad, Luther College.
William S. Rusk, Wells College.
Miss Edith Sanford, New Haven, Conn.
Henry B. Sargent, New Haven, Conn.
John A. Sawhill, Princeton University.
Prof. John N. Schaeffer, Franklin and Marshall College.
Prof. Felix E. Schelling, University of Pennsylvania.
Ellis Schnabel, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Harry Fletcher Scott, Ohio University.
Prof. R. Walker Scott, Washington and Jefferson College.

Miss Laura Seguine, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. Sidney Shepard, New Haven, N. Y.
Prof. Charles L. Sherman, Ohio Wesleyan University.
Prof. L. R. Shero, St. Stephen's College.
William Sloane, New York City.
Dr. Stanley B. Smith, Ohio State University.
Prof. W. G. Spencer, Franklin College.
Prof. Charles P. Steinmetz, Union College.
Prof. Guido Stempel, Indiana University.
Charles W. Stone, Boston, Mass.
S. Warren Sturgis, Groton, Mass.
Pres. M. Carey Thomas, Bryn Mawr College.
Miss Lena B. Tomson, Milwaukee-Downer College.
J. Homer Wade, Cleveland, O.
G. Byron Waldrop, Simsbury, Conn.
James R. Ware, Camden, N. J.
Miss Henrietta M. Washburn, Philadelphia, Pa.
Louis C. West, Cleveland, O.
Howell N. White, Lakeville, Conn.
Prof. John B. White, St. Johns College.
H. Rey Wolf, Ardmore, Pa.
Mrs. Helen D. Yetter, Denver, Colo.

The following report of the Treasurer was then read:

RECEIPTS

Balance, December 15, 1920	\$1036.85
Sales of <i>Transactions</i> and reprints	\$300.41
Membership dues, annual	1485.00
Membership dues, life	50.00
Initiation fees	573.00
Contributions to deficit fund	257.87
Interest	69.93
Dividends	6.00
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast: membership fees	162.50
Sale of Liberty Bonds, representing investment of three life membership fees	133.25
Subscriptions to the Proceedings of the Classical Association of England and Wales	12.00
Redemption of Canadian stamps50
Exchange on Canadian money	<u>.50</u>
Total receipts to December 15, 1921	<u>3050.96</u>
	\$4087.81

EXPENDITURES

Salary of Secretary and Treasurer	\$350.00
Printing and stationery	252.69
Postage	187.51
Express	2.19
Telegrams	5.92
Contribution to American Council of Learned Societies	32.80
Expenses of delegate to do.	11.05
Clerical help on publication, membership campaign, and endowment campaign	109.23
Expenses of endowment campaign in three districts	46.86
Binding <i>Transactions</i>	7.60
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland 5½% bonds: investment of four life membership fees	181.02
Total expenditures to December 15, 1921	\$1186.87
Balance, December 15, 1920	2900.94
	\$4087.81

The Chair announced the appointment of the usual committees, as follows:

To Audit the Treasurer's Accounts: Professors S. N. Deane and Clyde Pharr.

On the Place of the Next Meeting: Professors E. K. Rand, F. G. Allinson, and Campbell Bonner.

On Resolutions: Professors H. E. Burton, Florence A. Gragg, and G. C. Fiske.

The remainder of the session was devoted to the reading of papers.

JOINT SESSION WITH THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Wednesday evening, December 28.

The societies met at 8 P.M. in the Auditorium of the Natural Science Building, University of Michigan, Professor James C. Egbert, President of the Institute, presiding. About 100 people were present.

¹ The unusually small total of expenditures is due to the fact that the bill for *Transactions and Proceedings*, Vol. LI, the publication of which was delayed by a printers' strike, had not been presented. This item will appear in the report for 1922.

Dean John R. Effinger, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan, welcomed the societies, and Dr. Edgar L. Hewett responded.

The President of the Association, Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, delivered the annual address, on the subject *New Life out of Italy and Greece*.

SECOND SESSION

Thursday morning, December 29.

The Association was called to order by the President at 9.30 o'clock in the Auditorium of the Natural Science Building. The session was entirely devoted to the reading of papers, and was attended by about 65 people.

SECOND JOINT SESSION WITH THE INSTITUTE

Thursday evening, December 29.

The societies met at 8 P.M. in the Auditorium of the Natural Science Building, the President of the Association presiding. The session was devoted to the reading of papers. About 100 people were present.

THIRD SESSION

Friday morning, December 30.

The business meeting of the Association was called to order by the President at 9.30 o'clock in the Auditorium of the Natural Science Building. About 45 members attended.

The Committee to Audit the Treasurer's Accounts reported as follows:

We have examined these accounts of the Treasurer for 1921, including the vouchers for bills paid and the statement of account in depository bank, and we find the same correct.

December 30, 1921.

(Signed) Sidney N. Deane }
Clyde Pharr } *Auditors*

The report of the committee was adopted and placed on file.

The Committee on the Place of the Next Meeting, through its Chairman, Professor Rand, recommended that the next meeting be held at Yale University in December, 1922, in conjunction with the Archaeological Institute of America. The recommendation was adopted.

The following resolutions, reported by the Committee on resolutions, through its Chairman, Professor Burton, were then adopted:

Resolved, That we, the members of the American Philological Association, assembled at Ann Arbor for the Fifty-third Annual Meeting, express to the President and Regents of the University of Michigan our hearty appreciation of their kindness in welcoming the Association. We desire to express our indebtedness to the members of the Classical Faculty of the University and to their wives, and especially to the Chairman of the Local Committee, Dr. Frank E. Robbins. Their care and courtesy have contributed in every way to our comfort and pleasure. In an institution which, as Dean Effinger pointed out in his cordial words of welcome, has always been hospitable to classical learning, we have found a delightful temporary home.

Resolved, That we extend to Mr. Harry Russell Evans, organist, our hearty thanks.

Resolved, That we express to the Detroit Society of the Archaeological Institute of America and to the Detroit Arts and Crafts Society our grateful appreciation of their courtesy in entertaining the Association.

Resolved, That we extend our thanks to the Detroit Institute of Arts for its courtesy in opening its rooms to the Association.

The Association's Representatives on the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature, in a letter from their Chairman, Professor John C. Kirtland, reported that the work of the Committee was still somewhat short of completion. The report was accepted and the representation continued.

The report of the Committee on International Meetings was read, in the absence of the Committee, by the Secretary. It reviewed the difficulties encountered by the Committee, especially those raised by the War, referred to the participation of the Association, as recommended by the Committee, in the Anglo-American General Meeting held at Cambridge, England, August 2-5, 1921, commended the cordiality with which our members were received on that occasion by the Classical Association of England and Wales, and suggested the propriety of requesting the Secretary of our Association to communicate to the Council of the Classical Association our grateful appreciation of their hospitality and our hope for the opportunity of entertaining them at some future day on this side of the Atlantic. It also made the following recommendations:

That the delegates of the American Philological Association to the American Council of Learned Societies be requested to favor and advance, so far as they are able, the project of international meetings of philological scholars under the auspices of the Union Académique Internationale.

That the Committee of the American Philological Association on International Meetings be discharged from further service.

The report was adopted and placed on file; and a cordial vote of thanks was given the Committee for its service.

The Secretary of the Endowment Committee, Professor C. P. Bill, reported that the Committee, through its sub-committees, had secured to date subscriptions amounting to about \$8600, and was still continuing the campaign. The report was accepted and filed.

The Committee on an International Language presented the following preliminary report:

Your Committee has been in close touch with the American Branch of the Committee on International Auxiliary Language of the International Research Council, through the courtesy of the Chairman, Dr. F. G. Cottrell, and the Secretary, Mr. Ward Nichols, of Washington, D. C., who have kept the members of the Committee informed of the progress of study of the general question on the part of various organizations and individuals in this and other countries.

Upon many points involved in so ambitious a project as the one before us the members of the Committee are not clear as yet in their own minds, or have been unable to arrive at a consensus, but on a few principles substantial agreement has been reached. These are:

1. The Committee entertains grave doubt of the practicability of finding any language, either Latin or an artificial speech, which will commend itself alike to scholars, men of letters and of affairs, and to the common run of mankind. For the last-named, Latin, even in a somewhat enlarged and simplified form, will probably prove too difficult, for the others an artificial language will be repellent because of its uncouthness and inflexibility, while the introduction of idiomatic and varied expression would deprive it of its one serious claim to consideration, that is, simplicity and perspicuity.

Furthermore the Committee is not convinced of the need for direct communication between uneducated or imperfectly educated individuals in different countries. That direct communication between classes or groups of such persons who have common interests is desirable, may not be gainsaid, but such contact will inevitably have to be made through leaders and representatives and these can readily employ a medium of communication which the rank and file would never have either the patience or the leisure to master thoroughly. In the opinion of the Committee, therefore, the real desideratum is a language which will satisfy the intellectual and aesthetic demands of educated people of every land, and that language can hardly be any but Latin.

It may not be amiss in this connection to quote an eloquent sentence from Bishop Christopher Wordsworth: "When men of learning have ceased to possess a common language, they will soon forget that they have a common Country; they will no longer regard each other as intellectual compatriots; they will be Englishmen, Frenchmen, Dutchmen, but not Scholars" (*The Correspondence of Richard Bentley*, London, 1842, p. xv.)

2. The form of Latin to be adopted should be essentially, in vocabulary, syntax, and word order, what is known as "classical," with some slight simplifications, perhaps, such as the rejection of a by-form like *materies*, and the free inclusion of many words, which, though appearing only in late Latin or in the Middle Ages, have demonstrated their usefulness by being incorporated into modern languages, and for which classical Latin must employ periphrases, no matter how eloquently these may at times be conceived.

The vocabulary must be further enriched by the arbitrary creation of Latin or Latin-like words for the objects or ideas which have come into use only in modern times, like "telephone," "soviet," or "deflation of currency."

In matters of style, each competent scholar must, of course, remain a law unto himself, but in general the Committee would deprecate the employment of intricate and highly ingenious locutions and constructions, and recommend, as far as the subject-matter will allow, a somewhat Stoic simplicity and directness of expression.

3. In case a proposal should be adopted by some international authority competent and authorized to make recommendations in such a matter, the classical scholars of this country should stand ready to offer their services, in conjunction with the classical scholars of other lands, in the preparation of a grammar and general and technical lexics which may serve as a standard for correct usage.

4. Some members of the Philological Association ought, in the opinion of the Committee, to be authorized to keep in touch with the general developments of the discussion as they may affect classical interests, and so be prepared to bring such matters from time to time before this body for its consideration.

Respectfully submitted

R. G. Kent

D. P. Lockwood

C. W. Mendell

H. C. Nutting

W. A. Oldfather, *Chairman*

L. J. Paetow.

Professor L. J. Paetow wishes to add to Section 2 the following sentence: "For syntax and word-order, as well as for vocabulary, medieval and modern Latin should be studied and drawn upon freely in the construction of the proposed international Latin. To facilitate this, all friends of Latin should co-operate in the compilation of a dictionary of post-classical Latin to supplement the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*."

One member of the Committee, Professor Carl D. Buck, without caring to make a formal minority report, dissents from the opinion that, if there is to be an International Auxiliary Language, it should be Latin.

The report was adopted and the Committee continued.

The report of the Nominating Committee, presented by Professor C. D. Buck, was as follows:

President, Professor Francis Greenleaf Allinson, Brown University.

Vice-Presidents, Professor Edward Kennard Rand, Harvard University.

Professor Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont.

Secretary and Treasurer, Professor Clarence P. Bill, Western Reserve University.

Executive Committee, the above-named officers, and Professor Frank Cole Babbitt, Trinity College.

Dean Roy C. Flickinger, Northwestern University.

Dr. Richard Mott Gummere, William Penn Charter School.

Professor Gordon Jennings Laing, McGill University.

Professor Duane Reed Stuart, Princeton University.

Delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies, Professor William Kelly Prentice, Princeton University.

Delegate to the Council of the American Classical League, Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, University of Pennsylvania.

The Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association for the election of these officers.

The president announced the appointment of Professor Clifford H. Moore as a member of the Nominating Committee.

On recommendation of the Executive Committee the following resolutions were adopted:

Voted, That the amendment to the Constitution providing for an increase in dues, which was proposed at the last meeting, be laid on the table for another year.

Voted, That the statement of next year's dues contain a request, as did this year's statement, for a voluntary contribution of not less than one dollar in addition to the usual fee.

Voted, That the Executive Committee be authorized to give the Secretary-Treasurer an allowance for clerical help, of such amount as it deems proper, in addition to his present salary of \$350.

On motion of Professor B. L. Ullman it was

Voted, That the Secretary be instructed to confer with all other learned societies with a view to persuading the railroads to extend the period of special Christmas rates so that these rates may be of advantage to members of the societies in attending their meetings.

It was also voted to send the following telegram to Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve:

The American Philological Association in annual session at Ann Arbor, December 30, 1921, sends to you many felicitations, with love and esteem, and takes great pride in your ninety years of noble and serviceable living.

The remainder of the session was devoted to the reading of papers.

FOURTH SESSION

Detroit, Mich., Friday afternoon, December 30.

In the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents the Association was called to order by the Secretary at 3.45 P.M. in the Assembly Hall of the Detroit Public Library. The entire session was devoted to the reading of papers. About 75 people were present.

The total number of members present at the meeting was 87.

III. ABSTRACTS

1. *An Epigraphic Forgery*, by Professor Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan.

This paper deals with an iron sword blade which was offered for sale to the writer at Jerusalem in January, 1920, by a dealer in antiquities. On one side it had a Latin inscription dated in the reign of Nero and containing the name of Corbulo; on the other, low reliefs of military designs. It was said to have been found by the Bedouins in the region northeast of Damascus. Careful examination showed it to be a forgery.

It had been previously published as genuine by L. H. Vincent in the *Revue Biblique*, 1919, pp. 505-513; but he later admitted that he had been duped (*ib.* 1920, pp. 572-574). Because of being in the service he had not seen the article by Héron de Villefosse in the *Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*, 1913, pp. 333-335, in which the forgery had been pointed out (although the publication, based on photographs, was faulty).

The inscription as published by Vincent with the ligatures is here reproduced:

Line I. — NEROCLAVDIVSCAESARAVG · GEMAC · IMP · PONT · MX ·
TRIB · POT · XI · COS · IIII · IMP · VIII · PAT · P ·
Line II. — GN · DOMITIO@RBVL · NLEG · AVG · PROPR · T · AVRELIO
FVLVOLEG · AVG · LEG · III · GAL ·

The forgery is exceptionally clever, as forgeries go; but the inscription evidently was taken from *C. I. L.* III, 6741, where, however, the names of Corbulo and Fulvus are in the ablative case. The absurdity of making a presentation of the same sword to two officers of unequal rank is obvious enough; and there are slips in the inscription itself which are not of the sort made by ancient craftsmen. Equally patent are the traces of the modern hand in the reliefs, which it is not worth while even to describe; they are discussed at length in the first article by Vincent.

2. *Post-Mortem Wit in Folk Tale, Literature, and Roman Law*, by Professor Dean P. Lockwood, Haverford College.

The folk tale told by Horace (*Serm.* II, 5, 84-88), "anus improba Thebis | ex testamento sic est elata: cadaver | unctum oleo largo

nudis umeris tulit heres, | scilicet elabi si posset mortua; credo, | quod nimium institerat viventi," presents the picture of a testator, who humiliates the heir by a practical joke, akin to election bets and initiation 'stunts.' Exactly the same situation is found in the story of the *Calle della Machincuepa* in Thos. A. Janvier's *Legends of the City of Mexico* (1910). Similar material occurs in the plot of Rider Haggard's novel, *Mr. Meeson's Will*; and in the *controversia* (e.g. *pseudo-Quint.* no. 268) of the testator, who, having three sons (one a statesman, another a physician, and the third a philosopher), left his estate to the one of the three who had most benefited mankind. We may suspect that the old gentleman had a sense of humor, though it was lost on the rhetoricians! This moot case of the schools brings us close to the real cases of the law (cf. Roscoe Pound, *Readings in Roman Law* [Cambridge 1914] II, no. 9). Papinian says (*Dig.* xxxviii, 7, 15): "it is to be held that we cannot perform those things, which, if done, would be injurious to our piety or character or self-respect." Marcianus says (*Dig.* xxxviii, 7, 14): "conditions which are illegal, contrary to good morals, or derisory are regarded as if not written." And Paulus declares (*Sent.* III 4b, 2): "conditions written against statutes and decrees of the emperors or against good morals are of no effect, such as 'if you shall not marry,' 'if you shall commit murder,' 'if you shall appear publicly *in the costume of a savage or a ghost.*' "

3. *Crinagoras and his Epigrams*, by Professor Henry W. Prescott, University of Chicago.

After a sketch of the controversy between Cichorius and Mommsen regarding the inscriptional evidence the paper covered those epigrams of Crinagoras that reveal his close contact with Augustus and the court circle, with a view to suggesting the possible influence of Crinagoras as an intermediary between Greek culture and influential men and women at Rome in the critical decade from 30 B.C. on, and especially the manifest anticipation in Crinagoras' epigrams of the obsequious flattery, current in Hellenistic poetry, which at Rome was emerging in Augustan poetry and became consistently prominent in the reign of Nero, when court poetry was firmly established.

4. *Interest in the Aeneid, Ancient and Modern*, by Professor R. B. Steele, Vanderbilt University.

According to Wilkins the true object of Vergil in the *Aeneid* "is the growth of the greatness of Rome, and the care of Heaven for her welfare through all her perils and sufferings, until she found her haven of peace and prosperity under the Julian house." In developing this theme there was incorporated much that was wholly Roman. Aeneas merits the epithet *pius*, for he accepted his father's guidance without question. But it is not so much *pater Aeneas* as *patria* that is the fundamental conception of the poem. Some of Rome's mighty men are complimented by mentioning the part played by an ancestor, and many a place is honored by the enduring epithet applied to it. The ethical background is entirely Roman, with Roman rewards and penalties, the latter noticeable in the death of Dido for violation of *pudor*. Religious manifestations and heroic deeds are drawn from Roman history. A good illustration is Dido's fate, suggested by the death of Hasdrubal's wife at the capture of Carthage. Along with Roman substance went Roman artistic form, shown in many adaptations from earlier poetry, and many parallelisms to other works of Vergil's time.

Changes in religious conceptions and in attitude toward war have lessened modern interest in the *Aeneid*. Some day men may have for its portrayals of the activities of war the same feeling as there now is for acts of adherescent savagery, as that of Pyrrhus in killing Priam. Besides this the evidences of incompleteness, though in details, show that the work is not a harmonious whole. Still it reflects throughout the life and thought of one of the most efficient of nations, and the sure proof of its high dignity is found in the reflection of its words and spirit in many spheres of modern literary work.

PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST

I. PROGRAMME

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 25

FIRST SESSION, 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

ALWIN THALER

Costumes and Properties in the Elizabethan Theater

GEORGE M. CALHOUN

Solon and Criminal Law in Athens¹

JEFFERSON ELMORE

The Purpose of Decemviral Legislation²

LOUIS WANN

Milton's Relations with the Theatre

SECOND SESSION, 2 O'CLOCK P.M.

MONROE E. DEUTSCH

E Pluribus Unum

HENRY DAVID GRAY

Beaumont and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*

WALTER MORRIS HART

The Realism of Aphra Behn

RAYMOND M. ALDEN

Some Notes on So-called Trochaic Metres in English

BENJAMIN H. LEHMAN

The Etymological Method of the Early English Dictionaries

¹ To be published as part of a larger study.

² Published in *Classical Philology*, XVII (1922), 128-140.

THIRD SESSION, 8 o'CLOCK P.M.

WILLIAM A. COOPER

Goethe's Conception of the Poet's Calling
Annual Address of the President of the Association

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26

FOURTH SESSION, 10 o'CLOCK A.M.

RÉGIS MICHAUD

The French Short Story, History and Definitions

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH

Suggested Changes in the Revised Version of the Book of Acts

GUY MONTGOMERY

The Occasion and Purpose of Primitive Song

CARLOS BRANSBY

The English School Days of Edgar Allan Poe

PAPERS READ BY TITLE

JAMES T. ALLEN

Types of Greek Theaters and their Development:

I. The Fifth and Fourth Centuries¹

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY

An Unpublished *Comedia* Attributed to Lope de Vega

HOWARD J. HALL

Some American Colonial Book-Lists

¹ A discussion of the development of the Greek theatre with particular reference to the scene-building.

II. MINUTES

The twenty-third Annual Meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast was held in San Francisco, November 25 and 26, 1921, the morning and afternoon sessions at the Hotel St. Francis, and the evening session at the University Club, immediately after the annual dinner. Professor W. A. Cooper, of the Leland Stanford Junior University, and Professor M. E. Deutsch, of the University of California, presided. The following items of business were transacted:

The minutes of the last Annual Meeting were approved as printed in the *Publications* of the Modern Language Association and to be printed in the *Proceedings* of the American Philological Association.

The Treasurer made the following report for the year 1920-1921:

RECEIPTS	
Balance on hand, Nov. 26, 1920	\$262.54
Dues	510.30
Interest	5.00
Received from members for annual dinner	<u>4.00</u>
	\$781.84

EXPENDITURES	
Dues to American Philological Association	\$162.50
Dues to Modern Language Association of America	241.67
Printing, postage, stationery, etc.	126.17
Hotel Plaza Co. (room for 1920 meeting)	5.00
University Club (deficit on dinner and waiters' gratuity)	21.00
C. P. Bill (reprints of Elmore address)	1.20
Refunds of dues	6.00
Balance on hand, Nov. 23, 1921	<u>218.30</u>
	\$781.84

On motion the report was accepted and referred to the Auditing Committee.

The Chairman, Professor Cooper, appointed the following committees:

Nominating: Professors Hart, Alden, Petersson.

Auditing: Professors Foster, McKinlay, C. G. Allen.

Social: Professors Morley, Calhoun.

To prepare resolutions on the death of Professor Hempl: Professors Schilling, Deutsch, Johnston.

The Secretary gave the statistics of membership of the past year. He then read the following amendment to the Constitution which had been proposed one year before:

That Article iv ("Members") be amended by adding a new section, to read as follows: "§ 3. If at any future time either the American Philological Association or the Modern Language Association of America shall, for sufficient reasons, increase or diminish the sum of Two Dollars and Fifty Cents (\$2.50) now required from the Treasurer of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast to pay for an annual membership in the national organization in question, the Executive Committee shall be empowered, at its discretion, to increase or diminish the annual dues of those members whose membership includes membership in the national organization in question."

On motion the amendment was adopted.

On motion it was voted that the Executive Committee be instructed to consider ways in which it may be possible for the lady members of the Association to be present at the regular Third Session, at which the President reads his Annual Address.

The Auditing Committee reported that the accounts and vouchers of the Treasurer were correct and in order. On motion the report was adopted.

The Nominating Committee proposed the following officers for the ensuing year:

President, M. E. Deutsch.

Vice-Presidents, C. G. Allen, A. P. McKinlay.

Secretary, A. G. Kennedy.

Treasurer, S. A. Smith.

Executive Committee, the above-named officers and R. M. Alden, P. H. Reinsch, R. Schevill, E. A. Wicher.

On motion the report of the Committee was adopted and these officers elected.

The Committee on resolutions regarding the death of Professor Hempl offered the following report:

George Hempl was eminent both as an observer of living speech and an explorer of the records of extinct languages. The keenness of his observation enabled him to contribute largely to our knowledge of incipient dialects in this country, and to write an authoritative treatise on the local variations of German pronunciation. As an explorer of unknown languages he possessed an unusual combination of qualifications: to his mastery of linguistics were added a singular freedom from prepossession, an absolute independence of convention and tradition, and a vivid imagination checked and controlled by scientific training and habits. He was supremely happy in his work; he tasted the joy of dis-

covery to the full; as each new vista opened, the zest of exploration lured him from quest to quest, and it was not in his nature to pause and elaborate his results for publication. Characteristically, only the last of his researches is ready for the press; the fruits of his earlier work still await a sifting and ordering hand.

The Philological Association of the Pacific Coast mourns the loss of a distinguished scholar and a colleague universally beloved for his kindness and personal charm.

On motion the report was adopted, and it was ordered that the resolution be spread upon the minutes and a copy sent to the family of Professor Hempl.

On motion a vote of thanks for hospitality was extended to the Directors of the University Club, and the Treasurer was instructed to contribute from the funds of the Association the sum of five dollars to the 'Christmas Box' of the waiters at the University Club.

The attendance at the four sessions numbered 19, 35, 25 and 20, respectively.

Thirteen new members were elected.

INDEX

TO ARTICLES AND ABSTRACTS

Arabic numerals refer to pages of the *Transactions*, Roman to the *Proceedings*.

Ablative absolute: v. Hearer.	Hearer, the speaker and the: 16 ff.; hearer's influence on language: <i>ib.</i> , 39 f.; his misinterpretations of the speaker: <i>ib.</i> ; misunderstanding of sounds of a strange language: 18 ff.; misinterpretation in assimilation and dissimilation: 19 ff.; in syncope and apocope: 21; in word-formation: 21 ff.; in semantic changes: 26 ff.; in syntactical changes: 34 ff.; syncretism of instrumental and abl.: 34 f.; of subj. and opt.: 35 f.; development of the perf.: 35; of dat. of agent: 37; of acc. with inf.: 37 f.; of gen. and abl. absolute: 38 f.; inf. in commands: 39; development of pass. from mid.: <i>ib.</i>
Accent: v. Latin.	Homer, <i>Il.</i> : v. Homeric and Vergil. Homeric simile, function of: 132 ff.; not a simple comparison: 132 f.; previous views: 134 f.; two kinds of simile: 135; contrasts between material of similes and that of remainder of poem: 136 ff.; H's similes essentially lyric: 138 ff.; due to heightened emotion: 141 ff.; effect on the listener: 144 ff.
Accusative with infinitive: v. Hearer.	Ictus: v. Latin.
<i>Aetna</i> : 160.	Idiologus: v. Roman.
Apocope: v. Hearer.	Infinitive in commands: v. Hearer.
Arrian, <i>Discourses of Epictetus</i> , Bentley's critical notes on: 41 ff.	Iuridicus: v. Roman.
Assimilation: v. Hearer.	Latin accent, character of: 5 ff.; difficulties in assuming different types of accent for popular and formal Latin: 6 ff.; stress in formal Latin: <i>ib.</i> ; pitch in popular Latin: 8; difficulties of an assumed change
Bentley's critical notes on Arrian's <i>Discourses of Epictetus</i> : 41 ff.	
<i>Catalepton</i> : v. <i>Priapea</i> .	
Cicero: v. Tacitus.	
<i>Ciris</i> : 159 f.	
Contracts, two, for division of property, from Graeco Roman Egypt: 82 ff.; text: 84 ff., 89 ff.; translation: 87 ff., 91 ff.	
<i>Copa</i> : 161.	
Crinagoras and his epigrams: xviii.	
<i>Culex</i> : 157 f.	
Curtius: v. Tacitus.	
Dative of agent: v. Hearer.	
<i>Dirae</i> : 161.	
Dissimilation: v. Hearer.	
Egypt: v. Contracts and Roman.	
Ennius: v. Latin.	
Epictetus: v. Arrian.	
Epigraphic forgery, an: xvii.	
Epistrategus: v. Roman.	
Folk tales: v. Post-mortem.	
Genitive absolute: v. Hearer.	
Greek comedy, a fragment attributed to Menander: 69 ff.; inconclusive <i>indicia</i> of authorship: 69 f.; contents of the fragment: 70 f.; its use of tragic quotations compared with that in Menander: 71 ff.; translation: 73 ff.; part of text, with critical notes: 78 ff.	

from stress to pitch: 8 ff.; not explained by influence of Greek: 9 ff.; Ennius' borrowings from the Greek: 10 f.; clash of accent and ictus in E.: 11 f.; Latin accent a combination of stress and pitch: 12 ff.; clash of accent and ictus in first four feet of hexameter, harmony in last two: 13 ff.; *Aeneid* and *Iliad* compared as to position of word-ends: 14; as to distribution of sense-pauses: *ib.*

Livy: v. Tacitus.

Lyric element in Homer: v. Homeric.

Maecenas, the: 161 f.

Magic: v. Papyrus.

Menander: v. Greek comedy.

Moretum: 161.

Nepos: v. Tacitus.

Ovid: v. *Priapea*.

Papyrus describing magical powers: 111 ff.; text: 112; translation: 114; classification: 115 ff.

Passive voice, development from middle: v. Hearer.

Perfect tense, development of: v. Hearer.

Post-mortem wit in folk tales, literature, and Roman law: xvii.

Praefectus Aegypti: v. Roman.

Priapea, the, and the Vergilian Appendix: 148 ff.; authorship of the App.: *ib.*, 156 ff.; 'impersonations' of Tibullus by Ovid (Tib. II, 13; IV, 3 and 5): 150 ff.; Ovid's attitude toward his predecessors: 152 ff.; genuineness of Ovidian prefaces and arguments to the *Aeneid*: 153 ff.; Ovid the author of the App.: 156 ff.; *Culex*: 157 f.; *Ciris*: 159 f.; *Catalepton*, IX: *ib.*; *Cat.* V: 160; *Aetna*: *ib.*; *Dirae*: 161; *Moretum*: *ib.*; *Copa*: *ib.*; *Rosetum*: *ib.*; *Maecenas*: 161 f.; *Cat.* VI, XII, XIII: 162; 'impersonations' of Vergil: 162 f.; publication of the App.: 164 ff.; its original content: 166 f.; its history: 167 ff.; extant *Epigrammata*: 167 f.; the *Priapea* a part of the App.: 170 ff.; debt of *Priapea* to previous writers: 175 f.; its language and meter Ovidian: 177.

Property: v. Contracts.

Roman law: v. Post-mortem.

Roman officials in Egypt, the higher, their carrière in the second century: 96 ff.; prefect: 98 ff.; epi-strategus: 106 f.; iuridicus: 107 f.; idiologus: 109 f.

Rosetum: 161.

Semantic change: v. Hearer.

Simile: v. Homeric.

Speaker, the: v. Hearer.

Sword blade, spurious, for sale at Jerusalem: xvii.

Syncope: v. Hearer.

Syncretism: v. Hearer.

Syntax: v. Hearer.

Tacitus, *Agricola*, literary reminiscences in: 53 ff.; reminiscences of Sallust: *ib.*; Nepos: 56; Cicero: 61; Curtius: 61 ff.; Livy: 66; others: 68 and *passim*; borrowed phrases improved: 57 ff.; list of verbal parallels: 64 f.; function of the biographical sketch in the *Agr.*, Sallust, and Nepos: 65 f.; place of *Agr.* in the development of style: 66 ff.

Thericles, potter, in the light of Greek drama: 119 ff.; fame of his cups: 119 f.; their size: 120 f.; types: 121 ff.; date of T.: 122 f.; his historicity: 123 ff.; characteristics of Thericlean cylix: 128 ff.

Tibullus, II, 13; IV, 3 and 5: 150 ff.

Vergil, *Aen.*, interest in, ancient and modern: xix; v. Latin and *Priapea*.

Vergilian Appendix: v. *Priapea*.

Word-formation: v. Hearer.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RECORD¹

FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1921

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

A.A. — Art and Archaeology.
A.H.R. — American Historical Review.
A.J.A. — American Journal of Archaeology
A.J.P. — American Journal of Philology.
Am. — American.
B. — Bulletin.
Cal. Chr. — University of California Chronicle.
C.J. — Classical Journal.
C.P. — Classical Philology.
C.Q. — Classical Quarterly.
C.R. — Classical Review.
C.W. — Classical Weekly.
E.R. — Educational Review.
H.S.C.P. — Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.
J. — Journal.
J.A.O.S. — Journal of the American Oriental Society.

J.E.G.P. — Journal of English and Germanic Philology.
L.C.L. — Loeb Classical Library.
M. — Magazine.
M.L.A. — Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.
M.L.N. — Modern Language Notes.
M.P. — Modern Philology.
Nat. — Nation.
N.I.Y.B. — New International Year Book.
P.A.P.A. — Proceedings of the American Philological Association.
Pr. — Press.
Qu. — Quarterly.
Rev. — Review.
Rom.R. — Romanic Review.
S.S. — School and Society.
T.A.P.A. — Transactions of the American Philological Association.
U. — University.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

Alberici Gentilis Hispanicae ad-
vocationis libri duo, vol. I:
Latin text with introduction;
pp. xliv + 274. Vol. II: Trans-
lation (bearing title "The pleas
of a Spanish advocate"); pp.
x + 284 (Index by Arthur
Williams); New York: Ox-
ford U. Pr.
Some Latin inscriptions; *Se-
wanee Rev.* xxix, 424-432.
Rev. of Fowler's Roman essays
and interpretations; *C. P.* xvi,
297 f.
Rev. of Frank's Economic his-
tory of Rome to the end of
the Republic; *A.H.R.* xxvi,
309 f.
Rev. of Petersson's Cicero: a
biography; *ib.* xxvii.

CHARLES D. ADAMS.

ΤΑ ΓΕΡΡΑ ΕΝΕΙΠΙΜΠΡΑΣΑΝ,
Demosthenes, xviii, 169; *C.P.*
xvi, 1 ff.

LOUISE E. W. ADAMS.

A study in the commerce of
Latium from the Early Iron

Age through the sixth century
B.C.; *Smith College Classical
Studies*, no. II.
Rev. of Weege's Etruskische
Malerei; *A.J.P.* xlII, 283 f.

RAYMOND M. ALDEN.

Poems of the English race; pp.
xxv + 410; New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons.
Critical essays of the early nine-
teenth century; pp. xxvii +
410; New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons.
Rev. of Pollard's Shakespeare's
fight with the pirates: *N. Y.
Ev. Post Lit. Rev.*, Apr. 23.
Rev. of Wilde's The portrait of
Mr. W. H.: *ib.*, Dec. 3.
Rev. of Cross's History of
Henry Fielding; *J.E.G.P.* xx,
110-118.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

Menander: the principal frag-
ments with an English trans-
lation (*L.C.L.*); pp. xxxi +
540; London: W. Heinemann,
New York: G. P. Putnam's
Sons.

¹ An incomplete list of publications of the members during the calendar year 1921, as far as re-
ported by them to the editor. Where the number of a volume has not been given, that for 1921
is meant.

FLORENCE MARY BENNETT
ANDERSON.

An off-islander; pp. 311; Boston: Stratford Co.

WILLIAM FREDERIC BADE.

Permanent peace and religion; *Proc. First Pan-Pacific Educ. Conference*, 44 f.

Coördination of religious with general education; *ib.* 201 f. A conflict between dogma and ethics; *The Friend*, xc, 154-162.

John Muir in Yosemite; *Natural History*, xx, 124-141.

LEROY CARR BARRET.

The Kashmirian *Atharva-Veda*, VIII; *J.A.O.S.* xli, 264-289. Note on *Pāippalāda*, vi, 18; *ib.* xli, 318.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

Note on *Iliad*, II, 301 ff.; *C.P.* xvi, 387-389.

Rev. of von Wilamowitz' *Die Ilias und Homer*; *C.W.* xiv, 110-112.

Contributor to Archaeological news and discussions; *A.J.A.*

WILLIAM N. BATES.

Editor-in-chief: *A.J.A.*

HAVEN DARLING BRACKETT.

Shall it be Latin or Greek? *E.R.* lxi, 334-345.

GEORGE SIDNEY BRETT.

History of psychology, vol. II: Mediaeval and early modern period; pp. 394. Vol. III: Modern psychology; London: George Allen & Unwin, New York: Macmillan Co.

ETHEL HAMPSON BREWSTER.

Rev. of Jolliffe's *Phases of corruption in Roman administration in the last half-century of the Roman Republic*; *C.W.* xiv, 118.

W. NORMAN BROWN.

Vyāghramāri, or the lady tiger-killer: a study of the motif of bluff in Hindu fiction; *A.J.P.* xlII, 122-151.

Hindu stories in American negro folk-lore; *Asia*, xxI, 703-707, 730-732.

CARLETON L. BROWNSON.

Plato's studies and criticisms of the poets; pp. 158; Boston: Richard S. Badger.

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, vi & vii, *Anabasis*, I-III (L. C. L.); pp. 514; London: W. Heinemann, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

Studies in Greek noun-formation: Dental terminations, II; *C.P.* xvi, 51-62, 260-279, 367-383.

HARRY E. BURTON.

The elective system in the Roman schools; *C.J.* xvi, 532-535.

ALICE HILL BYRNE.

Titus Pomponius Atticus: chapters of a biography: pp. viii + 103; Lancaster, Pa.: New Era Printing Co.

GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN.

Demosthenes *Against Boeotus*, I (xxxix), 37-38; *C.P.* xvi, 287-288.

Xenophon *tragodos*; *C.J.* xvII, 141-149.

Editor: *Cal. Chr.*

HOWARD VERNON CANTER.

The paraclausithyron as a literary theme; *A.J.P.* xli, 355-368.

ALBERT J. CARNOY.

Les Indo-Européens: préhistoire des langues, des moeurs et des croyances de l'Europe; pp. 256; Brussels: Vromant & Co.

The semasiology of American and other slangs; *Leuvense Bijdragen*, 49-88, 181-204.

Le "Royaume de Dieu," dans l'Iran; *Le Muséon*, xxxiv, 110-121.

De internationale Taal; *Dietsche Warande & Belfort*, xxi, 1-13.

Rev. of Clark's *Collectanea Hispanica*; *Bull. Bibl. et Pedag. du Musée Belge*; xxv, 93 ff.

W. L. CARR.

The development of language; pp. 215; Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. (with H. F. Scott).

First-Year Latin and growth in English vocabulary; *S.S.* xiv, 192-198.

The classical survey; *C.J.* xvii, 16-27 (with Mason D. Gray).

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.

Charges of illegal practices of the department of Justice; hearings before a sub-committee, etc., U. S. Senate, 165-207; Washington.

The progress of the law, 1919-1920: equitable relief against torts; *Harvard Law Rev.* xxxiv, 388-415.

A contemporary state trial; *ib.* xxxv, 10-14.

Modernizing interpleader; *Yale Law J.* xxx, 814-844.

The reacquisition of a negotiable instrument; *Columbia Law Rev.* xxi, 538-553.

Your right of privacy; *N. Y. Ev. Post*, June 11.

The doctor as witness; *ib.*, July 2.

If fire damaged your property; *ib.*, Aug. 6.

Check swindlers' tricks; *ib.*, Sept. 3.

Rev. of Calhoun's Oral and written pleading in Athenian courts; *Harvard Law Rev.* xxxiv, 903.

Rev. of Taylor on Evidence; *ib.* 898 f.

Rev. of Brett's Defense of liberty; *N. Y. Ev. Post Lit. Rev.*, Apr. 16.

Rev. of Bennett's Freedom and liberty; *ib.*, Oct. 1.

Rev. of Pollock on Partnership; *Yale Law J.* xxx, 644 f.

Rev. of Swaney's Safeguards of liberty; *Columbia Law Rev.* xxi, 403 f.

GEORGE H. CHASE.

Archaeology in 1919; *C.J.* xvi, 271-279.

Two vases from Sardis; *A.J.A.* xxv, 111-117.

Two Greek heads; *Fogg Art Museum Notes*, i, 3-8.

J. E. CHURCH, JR.

Restoring wax painting to the practical arts; *School Arts Mag.* xx, 613-614.

EDITH FRANCES CLAFLIN.

The Latinisms in Shakespeare's diction; *C.J.* xvi, 346-359.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

Rev. of Schiaparelli's *La scrittura latina nell' età romana*; *A.J.P.* xlII, 285.

HARRISON C. COFFIN.

Allegorical interpretation of Vergil with special reference to Fulgentius; *C.W.* xv, 33-35.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Old Icelandic *raun* and *reyna*; *Scandinavian Studies and Notes*, vi, 58-67.

Saeculum; *Festschrift für Adalbert Bezzemberger* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 8-13.

LANE COOPER.

A university press at Cornell; *Cornell Alumni News*, xxiv, 146-148.

SIDNEY N. DEANE.

Editor: Archaeological news and discussions; *A.J.A.* xxv, 83-109; 161-206; 289-324; 397-433.

Editor: Bibliography of archaeological books, 1920; *ib.* 207-221.

Joint editor: *C.J.*

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

A first Latin book, for Catholic schools; pp. 288; Washington: Catholic Education Pr.

MONROE E. DEUTSCH.

Caesar and the Ambrones (Suetonius, *Iulius*, ix, 3); *C.P.* xvi, 256-259.

Rev. of Petersson's Cicero: a biography; *California Alumni Monthly*, xiv, 322.

NORMAN W. DEWITT.

Virgil's copyright; *C.P.* xvi, 338-344.

GEO. E. DIMOCK, JR.

Rev. of Eleanor Shipley Duckett's Hellenistic influence on the *Aeneid*; *Smith College Qu.*

BENJAMIN L. D'OOGE.

Concise Latin grammar; pp. xviii + 410; Boston: Ginn & Co.

Elements of Latin; pp. xiv + 384 + 42; Boston: Ginn & Co.

WILLIAM S. EBERSOLE.

Rev. of Kostes Palamas' Life immovable, trans. by Aristides E. Phoutrides; *C.J.* xvi, 381 f.

WALLACE S. ELDEN.

Rev. of Summers' Silver Age of Latin literature; *E.R.* lxii, 269 f.

HENRY RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH.

Some aspects of the Adriatic problem; *Cal. Chr.* xxiii, 95-104.

EDWARD FITCH.

Homerica; *C.J.* xvii, 94-95.

Rev. of Geffcken's *Die griechische Tragödie*, and Körte's *Die griechische Komödie*; *C.W.* xvi, 100-101.

ROY C. FLICKINGER.

Carmina Latina (2nd ed.); pp. 16; Chicago: U. of Chicago Pr.

Note on Livy, i, 25, 9; *C.J.* xvi, 369 f.

Rev. of Goodell's Athenian tragedy; *N. Y. Ev. Post*, July 9.

B. O. FOSTER.

Livy, vii, 14, 6-10; *A.J.P.* xlii, 174 f.

HAROLD NORTH FOWLER.

Plato, vol. ii: *Theaetetus* and *Sophist* (L. C. L.); pp. ix + 459; London: W. Heinemann, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

TENNEY FRANK.

Horace, *Carm.* iii, 4: *Descende caelo*; *A.J.P.* xlii, 170-173.

The *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace; *ib.* 324-329.

Placentia and the battle of the Trebia; *J. Rom. Stud.* ix, 202-207.

The Scipionic inscriptions; *C.Q.* xv, 169-171.

Horace's 'swan' song, *Carm.* ii, 20; *C.P.* xvi, 386-387.

ALBERTA MILDRED FRANKLIN.

The Lupercalia; dissertation; pp. 105; New York: Columbia U. Pr.

ROBERT MAX GARRETT.

Japanese lyric poetry as an aid to teaching description; *English J.*, June.

Maeterlinck and mediaeval gardens; *Sewanee Rev.*, Jan.

Mystery in Seattle; *Dialect Notes*, v, part iv.

Rev. of Gilbert M. Tucker's American English; *Pacific Rev.*, Dec.

Rev. of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's *On the art of reading*; *ib.*, June.

HENRY S. GEHMAN.

The *Peta-Vatthu*, translation of Book 1; *Reformed Church Rev.* xxiv, 117-126, and *Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register*, vi, 206-213.

JOHN L. GERIG.

Modern philology; *N.I.Y.B.* 536-540.

Doctoral dissertations in the Romance languages at Columbia University: a survey and bibliography; *Rom. R.* xii, 73-79.

Rev. of J. Roger Charbonnel's *La pensée italienne au xvi^e siècle et le courant libertin*; *M.L.N.* xxxvi, 166-174.

Associate editor: *Rom. R.*

JOHN MARSHALL GEST.

Notes upon continental legal literature; *U. of Penn. Law Rev.* LXIX, 121-141.

WILLIAM CHASE GREENE.

Rev. of Summers' The Silver Age of Latin literature; *Weekly Rev.* iv, 88.

The study of classics as experience of life; *C.J.* xvi, 280-288.

The roll of honor; *Am. Oxonian*, vii, 161-168.

Contentment in poverty; *North Am. Rev.*, ccxiv, 648-654.

Rev. of White's *Andivius Hedulio*; *N. Y. Ev. Post Lit. Rev.*, Dec. 3, 219.

RICHARD M. GUMMERE.

The American school; *Am.-Scandinavian Rev.*, Feb., 132-136.

The English essay and some of its ancient prototypes; *C.W.* xiv, 155-160.

Vocational tyranny; *Weekly Rev.*, no. 115, pp. 77 f.

Seven reviews in the *N. Y. Ev. Post Lit. Rev.*

R. K. HACK.

Rev. of Barrett Wendell's The traditions of European literature from Homer to Dante; *Atl. Monthly*, Feb.

Rev. of Fiske's *Lucilius and Horace*; *Freeman*, Feb., 523.

Education by force: *ib.*, Sept., 7-8.

GEORGE DEPUE HADZSITS.

Editor-in-chief: Our debt to Greece and Rome; Boston: Marshall Jones & Co.

Editor: A bibliographic monograph on the value of the classics; pp. 35; U. of Penn.

E. ADELAIDE HAHN.

Aeneid, II, 781 and *Aeneid*, III again: Aeneas's attitude towards visions; *C.W.* xiv, 122-126.

Horace, *Serm.* I, 3, 29-34 once more; *ib.* xv, 32.

Cats and dogs — today and yesterday; *ib.* 48.

Rev. of Perrin's translation of Plutarch's *Lives*; *N. Y. Herald*, Sept. 11, sec. 7, p. 9, and Sept. 18, sec. 7, p. 10.

LEWIS R. HARLEY.

Bibliographical monograph on the value of the classics; pp. 80; Philadelphia: U. of Penn.

G. A. HARRER.

Rev. of H. J. Bassett's *Macrinus and Diadumenianus*; *C.W.* xiv, 174 f.

Rev. of E. J. White's *Lawyers of ancient Rome*; *Am. Law Rev.* LV, 427 f.

Rev. of J. Hasebroek's *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus*; *A.J.P.* XLII, 284.

KARL POMEROY HARRINGTON.

Musical editor: *The light of the world, a program for Children's Day*, by Katharine Lee Bates; pp. 16; New York: Abingdon Pr.

Editor: *A little pathfinder to places of interest near North Woodstock*, N. H., 4th ed.; pp. 32; publ. by North Woodstock Improvement Ass'n.

A lost opportunity; *Zion's Herald*, XCIX, 590.

Wooing and the wooed; *C.J.* XVII, 132-140.

OTTO HELLER.

Reviews of new books; *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, on Saturday of each week.

The reader at sea; *Public Libraries*, XXVI, no. 8.

J. W. HEWITT.

The humor of the Greek Anthology; *C.J.* XVII, 66-76.

VICTOR DWIGHT HILL.

Rev. of Hubbell's *The Rhetorica of Philodemus*: translation and commentary; *C.J.* XVI, 508 f.

Rev. of Sheppard's *The Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles, translated and explained; *ib.* 509 f.

ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

Word-grouping in Vergil; *C.W.* XIV, 193-195.

Contribution to F. E. Sabin's Classical associations of places in Italy, 83.

J. EMORY HOLLINGSWORTH.

Our ancestry linguistic; *C.J.* XVI, 410-417.

GEORGE EDWIN HOWES.

Report of the Administrative Division (of the United States

Fuel Administration) 1917-1919, part II: Reports of bureaus with headquarters at Washington, D. C., edited by G. E. H.; Washington: Government Printing Office.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

Olympic victor monuments and Greek athletic art: pp. xx + 406, illustr.; Washington: Carnegie Institution.

The charm of Greek travel; *Sewanee Rev.* XXIX, 392-408.

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.

The location of the Farnbāg fire, the most ancient of the Zoroastrian fires; *J.A.O.S.* XLI, 81-106.

Firdausi in a lyric vein; *Sanj Vartaman* (Bombay), Sept. 10, p. 8-i.

Gabars, Manichaeism, Mazdak, Parsis, Religions of Persia, Sacred scriptures: Pahlevi literature; *Dict. of Religion and Ethics*, ed. Shailer Mathews; New York.

Rev. of Hume's Thirteen principal Upanishads; *N. Y. Ev. Post*, Aug. 20.

Rev. of Reitzenstein's *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*; *A. H.R.* XXVII, 139-140.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

Why did Ganelon hate Roland? *M.L.A.* XXXVI, 119-133.

ARTHUR LESLIE KEITH.

Vergil's allegory of Fama; *C.J.* XVI, 298-301.

Briefly speaking in Vergil; *C.W.* XV, 50-51.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

Rev. of A. D. Godley's *Q. Horatii Flacci carminum librum quintum* a Rudyardo Kipling et Carolo Graves Anglice redditum, etc.; *C.W.* XIV, 181-183.

Report of *Philologus*, LXXVI (1920), 1-2; *A.J.P.* XLII 176-180.

ROLAND G. KENT.

Some features of word-composition in Lithuanian; *Slavonic Studies*, II, 3, 3-10.

Addendum on a difficult Old Persian passage; *J.A.O.S.* XLI, 74 f.

Horace, *Odes*, IV, 6, 1-28: another study in punctuation; *C.W.* XIV, 144.

Rev. of Sturtevant's Pronunciation of Latin and Greek; *A.J.P.* XLII, 183-185.

Deciphers Roger Bacon manuscripts; *The Pennsylvania Gazette*, XIX, 851-853.

Rev. of the Union Trust Company of Providence R. I.'s Edict of Diocletian establishing a maximum schedule of prices for commodities and services throughout the Roman Empire, 301 A.D.; *C.W.* xv, 15 f.

CLINTON WALKER KEYES.

Original elements in Cicero's ideal constitution; *A.J.P.* XLII, 309-323.

WM. HAMILTON KIRK.

And and or; *A.J.P.* XLII, 1-11. *Uti legassit*; *C.P.* XVI, 246-250.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Philology, classical; *N.I.Y.B.* 530-536.

Lucretius, I, 1-28: a study in interpretation and punctuation; *C.W.* XIV, 73, 168.

Some illustrations of Juvenal's third satire; *ib.* 113-114, 121-122.

An illustration of Horace, *Serm.* I, 3; *ib.* 137-138.

Horace, *Serm.* I, 3, 29-34: a matter of style; *ib.* 153-154.

Horace, *Epodes*, II, 33-34; *ib.* 177-178.

Rev. of Trevelyan's Translations from Lucretius; *C.W.* xv, 76-77.

Rev. of Some new volumes in the Oxford Junior Latin Series; *ib.* 30-31.

Managing editor: *C.W.* Editorial and other contributions (including book notices), esp. XIV, 77 f., 79 f., 104, 129 f., 145 ff., 161 f., 168, 169 f., 176, 201 ff., 207, xv, 1 f., 9 f., 16, 24, 25 f., 31, 39 f., 55 f., 72, 78 f.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

Editor: *Harvard Oriental Series*; Cambridge, Mass.: Harv. U. Pr. (with the coöperation of various scholars).

Vols. XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, Buddhist Legends, translated from the original Pali text of the Dhammapada Commentary, by Eugene Watson Burroughs, with introduction, and synopses of the stories, and a photogravure of a palmleaf manuscript; pp. 366, 370, and 396.

J. O. LOFBERG.

Nil sine magno vita labore dedit mortalibus; *C.J.* XVI, 220-229.

Trial by jury in Athens and America; *ib.* XVII, 3-15.

"Unmixed milk" again; *C.P.* XIV, 389-391.

EUGENE S. McCARTNEY.

An animal weather bureau; *C.W.* XIV, 89-93, 97-100.

Three linguistic heirlooms; *C.J.* XVI, 368.

DAVID MAGIE.

Greek and Latin inscriptions from the Ledja; *Publications of the Princeton Archaeological Expeditions to Syria*, III, A. part 7; Leyden: Brill.

RALPH VAN DEMAN MAGOFFIN.

Morale work in an army camp; *Historical Outlook*, xi, 49-52.
 Rev. of Jenison's History of the province of Sicily; *C.W.* xiii, 26, 208.
 Rev. of Grotius' *De iure belli ac pacis*, ed. Molhuysen; *Am. J. Internat. Law*, xiv, 692-693.
 Rev. of Cagnat and Chapot's *Manuel d'archéologie romaine*, vol. II; *A.H.R.* xxvi, 752-754.
 Note on Bates' Our allies and enemies in the near East; *Pol. Sc. Qu.* xxxv, 329.
 Rev. of Trevelyan's Short history of the Italian people; *ib.* xxxvi, 138-139.
 Note on Wagner's *La Revanche de la Kultur*; *ib.* 166.

HERBERT W. MAGOUN.

Agni Vrtrahan and the Avestan Verethraghna; *Studies in honor of Maurice Bloomfield*, 197-210.
 Creation's beginnings; *Bib. Champ.* xxvii, 47-53.
 Creation's fourth day; *ib.* 90-97.
 Mesozoic and Cenozoic time; *ib.* 140-146.
 Causes and effects of the ice cap; *ib.* 181-186.
 Flood legends and traditions; *ib.* 239-243.
 Evidences of a flood in Europe; *ib.* 269-274.
 Evidences of a flood in Asia and on other continents; *ib.* 307-313.
 The testimony of the oceanic islands; *ib.* 364-369.
 Putting two and two together; *ib.* 409-416.
 The flood and its survivors; *ib.* 456-463.
 The tap-root of higher criticism and the new theology; *Cent. Meth.* lv, nos. 47 (6-7) and 48 (4-5).

Various editorials (*Bib. Champ.*), notes (*ib.*), book reviews (*ib.* and *Bib. Sac.*), and parabolic sketches under the name M. W. Herbertus (*Bib. Champ.*), besides brief articles elsewhere.

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING.

The problem of unreality in Russian literature; *Sewanee Rev.* xxix, 351-359.
 Russian literature and the Orthodox Church; *Am. Church Monthly*, x, 141-153.

ALLAN MARQUAND.

Benedetto and Santi Buglioni; pp. lxvi + 223; Princeton, London, Oxford: Princeton U. Pr.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

The owl sacred pack of the Fox Indians; B. 72 (pp. 84) *Bur. Am. Ethnology*.
 Two phonetic shifts occurring in many Algonquian languages; *Internat. J. Am. Linguistics*, i, 300-304.
 Who were the Padouca? *Am. Anthropologist*, N. S. xxiii, 101.
 The classification of American languages; *ib.* 236-237.

CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW.

Rev. of Haarhoff's Schools of Gaul; *A.H.R.* xxvi, 563-564.

C. W. E. MILLER.

To Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve; *A.J.P.* xlII, v.
 Notice of the Association Guillaume Budé's publications; *ib.* 94.
 Notice of the Liebaert Collection of Photographs; *ib.* 189.
 Rev. of Heidel's Anaximander's book, the earliest known geographical treatise; *ib.* 368-369.
 Editor: *A.J.P.*

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

Prophecy in the ancient epic;
H.S.C.P. xxxii, 99-175.
Sundry reviews and reports.

LEWIS F. MOTT.

Ernest Renan; pp. ii + 432;
New York; D. Appleton &
Co.
Foreign politics in an old play;
M.P. xix, 65-71.

CLYDE MURLEY.

Rev. of Sturtevant's The pro-
nunciation of Greek and Latin;
C.J. xvi, 315 f.
 $\Sigma \nu \kappa \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \eta \varsigma$ and $\sigma \kappa \iota \nu \sigma \varsigma$; *ib.* 199.
Self-consciousness and the in-
formal style; *Tex. Rev.* vi,
292 ff.
Correspondence in *Atl. Monthly*,
cxxxviii, 430 f.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

Petrarch's *Africa*; *A.J.P.* xlii,
97-121.
Report of *Rev. de Phil.* xliv,
3-4; *ib.* 83-84.
Report of *Riv. di Fil.* xlvi; *ib.*
180-82, 271-273.
Notices of Pasquali's Orazio
lirico, Ernout's Lucrèce, *De
la nature*, Haines' Fronto, vol.
ii, Ker's Martial, vol. ii,
Stampini's Studi di lettera-
tura e filologia, vol. ii,
Rostagni's Ibis; *ib.* 93-94,
188-189.
Notes on Ben Jonson's Catiline;
M.L.N. xxxvi, 154-157.
Pegasus as the poet's steed;
ib. 58, and *C.W.* xiv, 200.
Rev. of Summers' The Silver
Age of Latin literature; *ib.* 151-
152

H. C. NUTTING.

Elliptical conditional sentences;
C.W. xiv, 94-95.
Vergil's *Aeneid*, vi, 391 ff.; *ib.*
xv, 49-50.

Taking account of stock; *C.J.*
xvi, 257-260.

The dative with certain com-
pound verbs; *ib.* 368-369.

Ad Alpes, i-vi; *C.J.* xvi, 418-
422, 488-493, xvii, 36-41.

On the unity of *Integer Vitae*;
C.J. xvi, 536-539.

The element of interest; *ib.*
xvii, 113-117.

The classical survey under the
auspices of the American
Classical League; *Sierra Ed.*
News, Aug., pp. 59-60.

Horace, *A.P.* 179 ff.; *C.P.*
xvi, 384-386.

Joint-editor: *C.J.*

IRENE NYE.

The price of a one-language
policy; *S.S.* xiii, 507-508.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

Latin as an international lan-
guage; *C.J.* xvi, 195-206.
A note on the *Lexicon Militare*;
C.P. xvi, 74-76 (with J. B.
Tichener).

Ysopet-Avionnet: the Latin and
French texts; *Univ. of Ill.
Stud. in Lang. and Lit.* v, 220-
506 (with Kenneth McKenzie).

Editor: *U. of Ill. Stud. in Lang.
and Lit.* vii; pp. 700.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE.

Sceleratum frigus; *C.P.* xvi, 81.
Paralipomena; *ib.* 200.

Rev. of Lilly's The georgic;
J.E.G.P. xx, 125-127.

Rev. of Wedel's The mediaeval
attitude toward astrology; *ib.*
286-288.

Rev. of Broughton's The Theo-
critean element in the works
of William Wordsworth; *ib.*
412-414.

M. Tulli Ciceronis de divinatione
liber primus, part i; *U. of Ill.
Stud. in Lang. and Lit.* vi,
no. 2; pp. 168. Part ii; *ib.*
no. 3; pp. 170.

Virgilian determinism; *C.W.* xv, 2-5.

D. A. PENICK.

Paul's epistles compared with one another and with the epistle to the Hebrews; *A.J.P.* XLII, 58-72.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER.

Comic terminations in Aristophanes, part v; *A.J.P.* XLII, 152-161.

TORSTEN PETERSSON.

Cicero: a biography; pp. i + 699; Berkeley; U. of Cal. Pr.

ARISTIDES E. PHOUTRIDES.

A hundred voices and other poems by Kostes Palamas, translated by A. E. P.; pp. iv + 228; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Pr.

Rev. of Gilbert Murray's and Locke Ellis' translations of the *Agamemnon*; *N. Y. Ev. Post Lit. Rev.* i, no. 43, p. 6. Among the poets of Athens; *ib.* i, no. 36, p. 7.

WILLIAM KELLY PRENTICE.

Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus; *C.W.* xv, 26-29.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT.

Callimachus' epigram on the nautilus; *C.P.* XVI, 327-337.

E. K. RAND.

Two American prospects; Phi Beta Kappa address at Stanford University, June 19, 1920; reprinted from the chapter proceedings.

Rev. of Clark's *Collectanea Hispanica*; *A.J.P.* XLII, 354-362.

PROF. A. T. ROBERTSON.

Paul the interpreter of Christ; New York: Geo. H. Doran

Co., London: Hodder & Stoughton.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

A cylix in the style of Duris; *A.J.A.* xxv, 1-17.

Etruscan and later terra-cotta antefixes at the Johns Hopkins University; *ib.* 79-80.

Discovery of a new prehistoric site in Greece at Zygouries; *A.A.* XII, 38-39.

Rev. of Vaughan's *Madness in Greek thought and custom*; *C.W.* XIV, 150-151.

Rev. of McClees' *A study of women in Attic inscriptions*; *ib.* 197-199.

Rev. of Marshall's *Discovery in Greek lands*; *ib.* 166-167; *A.A.* XI, 267.

Rev. of Allen's *The Greek theatre of the fifth century before Christ*; *C.W.* xv, 29-30; *A.A.* XI, 268.

Rev. of Poulsen's *Delphi*; *C.W.* xv, 45-48; *A.A.* XII, 45-46.

Rev. of Beazley's *Attic red-figured vases in American museums*; *A.A.* XI, 77-78.

Rev. of Frank's *Economic history of Rome to the end of the Republic*; *ib.* 79.

Rev. of Hambidge's *Dynamic symmetry*; *ib.* 123-125.

Rev. of Havell's *Ideals of Indian art*; *ib.* 125.

Rev. of Ferguson's *Outlines of Chinese art*; *ib.* 125-126.

Rev. of Miss Richter's *Catalogue of engraved gems of the classical style*, Metropolitan Museum of Art; *ib.* 173; *N. Y. Ev. Post Lit. Rev.*, May 21, p. 8. Rev. of O'Connor's *Charm of Kashmir*, *A.A.* XII, 46-47.

Rev. of Nutting's *Furniture of the pilgrim century, 1620-1720*; *ib.* 282-283.

Editor-in-chief: *Art Bulletin*.

Associate editor: *C.W.*, *A.A.*, *A.J.P.*

DWIGHT NELSON ROBINSON.

Plays and songs for Latin clubs; pp. 31; Delaware, O.: Independent Print Shop.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

Sallust (L.C.L.); pp. xxii + 535; London: W. Heinemann, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Latin verses; *C.W.* XIV, 128.

FRANCES ELLIS SABIN.

Classical associations of places in Italy; pp. 526; Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co.

EVAN T. SAGE.

Editor: *U. of Pittsburgh Latin Dept. News Letter.*

Associate Editor: *C.W.*

HENRY A. SANDERS.

A papyrus manuscript of the minor prophets; *Harvard Theological Rev.* XIV, 181-187.

HARRY FLETCHER SCOTT.

The development of language; pp. 215; Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. (with W. L. Carr).

JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.

The unity of Homer; pp. 276; Berkeley, Cal.: U. of Cal. Pr. Homer as the poet of the *Thebais*; *C.P.* XVI, 20 ff.

The following notes in *C.J.* XVI: Some Biblical and Homeric parallels; Vergil's interpretation of *Il.* xxiii, 670; The aorist participle in *Od.* II, 3; Antigonus and the Homeric authorship of the *Thebais*; Athenaeus on Aeschylus and Homer; The test of the patronymics; The goose and the dog in Homer.

CAROLINE SHELDON.

The disinherited; *C.W.* XV, 51-52.

L. R. SHERO.

The Greek *deipnon*; *St. Stephen's Coll. B.* XLII, no. 2.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

Intellect and the undergraduate; *S.S.* XIII, 241-251.

Science and humanism; *ib.* XIV, 85-87.

The parson's prescription; *Unpartisan Rev.* XV, 121-130.

The university brickyard; *Weekly Rev.* IV, 126-127.

A country benedict; *Century*, CII, 692-703.

Rev. of Linforth's Solon the Athenian; *Nat.* CXII, 671.

Rev. of Miller's Ovid's *Metamorphoses*; *C.P.* XVI, 304.

Rev. of Clark's *Collectanea Hispanica*; *New Republic*, Aug. 17.

E. G. SIHLER.

Notes on the grammatical identity of the Septuagint and the New Testament; *Theol. Qu.* (St. Louis), 4.

The professor's point of view; *N. Y. U. Alumnus*, Dec.

M. S. SLAUGHTER.

Rev. of Warde Fowler's *Aeneas at the site of Rome*; *A.J.P.* XLII, 186-187.

Cicero and his critics; *C.J.* XVII, 120-131.

ELIZABETH F. SMILEY.

The simple life in Vergil's *Bucolics* and minor poems; *C.J.* XVI, 516-531.

GERTRUDE E. SMITH.

The prytaneum in the Athenian amnesty law; *C.P.* XVI, 345-353.

Rev. of Godley's translation of Herodotus, vol. I; *ib.* 303 f.

KENDALL K. SMITH.

Rev. of Wendell's The traditions of European literature; *Chr. Sci. Mon.* XIII.

Rev. of Seligman's The victory of Venizelos; *ib.*

Rev. of Harmon's The *Birds* of Aristophanes; *ib.*

Rev. of Goodell's Athenian tragedy; *ib.*

Rev. of Petersson's Cicero: a biography; *ib.*

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

The Commentary on Aeschylus' *Prometheus* in the Codex Neapolitanus; *H.S.C.P.* XXXII, 1-98.

WILLIAM GEAR SPENCER.

Slang; *Educational Issues*, II, no. 2.

An experiment in translating Latin; *ib.* no. 4.

The religious life of a college; *The Baptist*, II, no. 37; reprinted in the *Baptist Observer*, XX, no. 46.

R. B. STEELE.

Clitarchus; *A.J.P.* XLII, 40-57.

Ablative of the efficient; *C.P.* XIV, 345-361.

Some spheres of Roman originality; *C.W.* XIV, 138-143.

The Book of Job: *Methodist Quarterly Rev.* 523-534.

ROBERT PARVIN STRICKLER.

Report of *Rh. Mus.* LXXIII, 1-2; *A.J.P.* XLII, 348-353.

DUANE REED STUART.

On Vergil, *Ecl.* IV, 60-63; *C.P.* XVI, 209-230.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Die Endung des Partizipium präteriti der germanischen starken Verben; *A.J.P.* XLII, 12-24.

Zum Vokalismus des gotischen *And-waihando*, Röm. 7, 23,

in seinem Verhältnis zu Altisländischem *Vega*, 'töten'; *J.E.G.P.* XX, 22-27.

Zum altnordischen Vokalismus; *ib.* 513-538.

Rev. of Seip's *Norsk Sproghistorie*; *ib.* 399-402.

Oehlenschläger and Tegnér's *Frithiofssaga*; *Scandinavian Studies and Notes*, VI, 134-158.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

Word-ends and pauses in the hexameter; *A.J.P.* XLII, 289-308.

On the frequency of short words in verse; *C.W.* XV, 73-76.

EUGENE TAVENNER.

Roman moon lore; *Washington U. Studies*, VIII, Humanistic Series, no. 1, pp. 39-59.

ARCHER TAYLOR.

In the evening praise the day; *M.L.N.*, XXXVI, 115-118.

The Devil and the advocate; *M.L.A.*; XXXVI, 35-59.

Judas Iscariot in charms and incantations; *Washington U. Studies*, VIII, Humanistic Series, 3-17.

The death of Orvar Oddr; *M.P.* XIX, 93-106.

The Judas curse; *A.J.P.* XLII, 234-252.

Arthur and the wild hunt; *Rom. R.* XII, 286-289.

JOHN WILSON TAYLOR.

Georgius Gemistus Pletho's criticism of Plato and Aristotle; pp. vii + 100; Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co.

A misunderstood tract by Theodore Gaza; *Archiv f. Gesch. der Philosophie*, XXXIII, 150-155.

I. C. THALLON.

New light on some problems of ancient history; *C.W.* XV, 10-15.

CLARA LOUISE THOMPSON.

Seneca's *Octavia*, with introduction and notes; pp. xxxiii + 77; Boston: Stratford Co.

HERBERT CUSHING TOLMAN.

Persian words in the glosses of Hesychius; *J.A.O.S.* xli, 236-237.

B. L. ULLMAN.

Hints for teachers; *C.J.* xvi, 311-313, 377-380, 440-442, 505-507, 564-566, xvii, 42-45, 103-105, 171-175.

The demand for Latin teachers; *U. of Iowa Service B.* v, no. 18.

Caesar's funeral in Lucan, viii, 729-735: an unrecognized description; *C.Q.* xv, 75-77.

Rev. of Burnam's A classical technology; *C.J.* xvi, 316-317.

Rev. of D'Ooge's Concise Latin grammar; *ib.* xvii, 106-107.

Rev. of Le Roux's *De Richardo Bentleio atque de ratione eius critica*; *C.P.* xvi, 90-92.

Rev. of Clark's, *pro Milone, pro Marcello*, etc., ed. altera; *ib.* 207-208.

Rev. of Pascal's *La critica dei poeti romani in Orazio*; *ib.* 393-394.

Rev. of Sell's *De Catulli carmine sexagesimo quarto quaestiones diversae*; *ib.* 404-406.

Rev. of Gudeman's *P. Cornelii Taciti de Germania*; *C.W.* xv, 35-37.

Associate editor: *C.J.*

HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESEN.

Short cataloguing and bibliographical cataloguing; *Am.*

Library Institute Proc. (pre-print).

LA RUE VAN HOOK.

Rev. of Elliott's Transition in the Attic orators; *C.W.* xiv, 149-150.

Teaching the classics; *Weekly Rev.*, Aug. 6.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

The Siège de Barbastre; *Rom. R.* vii, 155-167.

Two sketches; *The Midland*, vii, 253-257.

Two poems; *ib.* 319.

Rev. of Pargment's *Exercice français*; *E.R.* xli, 443-445.

General editor: Labiche and Martin, *La poudre aux yeux*, L. Cardon; Dumas, *Le demi-monde*, Smith and Mitchell; Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, A. G. H. Spiers; New York: Oxford U. Pr.

Joint editor: *Rom. R.*

ELIZA G. WILKINS.

A classification of the similes in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes; *C.W.* xiv, 162-166.

A classification of the similes in Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics*; *ib.* 170-174.

CAROLINE RANSOM WILLIAMS.

An Egyptian sketch on limestone; *Quarterly B. N. Y. Hist. Soc.*, Jan.

HORACE WETHERILL WRIGHT.

Rev. of J. R. Crawford, *De Bruma et Brumalibus festis*; *C.W.* xv, 52 f.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION
1921-1922

PRESIDENT
FRANCIS GREENLEAF ALLINSON

VICE-PRESIDENTS
EDWARD KENNARD RAND
SAMUEL E. BASSETT

SECRETARY AND TREASURER
CLARENCE P. BILL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The above-named officers, and —

FRANK COLE BABBITT
ROY C. FLICKINGER
RICHARD MOTT GUMMERE
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
DUANE REED STUART

OFFICERS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIA-
TION OF THE PACIFIC COAST

PRESIDENT
MONROE E. DEUTSCH

VICE-PRESIDENTS
CLIFFORD G. ALLEN
ARTHUR P. MCKINLAY

SECRETARY
ARTHUR G. KENNEDY

TREASURER
STANLEY A. SMITH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The above-named officers, and —

RAYMOND M. ALDEN
PAUL H. REINSCH
RUDOLPH SCHEVILL
EDWARD A. WICHER

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION¹

1921-1922

Dr. Elizabeth F. Abbe, Melrose High School, Melrose, Mass. 1919.
William F. Abbot, Classical High School, Worcester, Mass. (20 John St.). 1893.
Prof. Frank Frost Abbott, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1886.
Dr. Charles J. Adamec, Alfred College, Alfred, N. Y. 1922.
Prof. Arthur Adams, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1908.
Prof. Charles Darwin Adams, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1892.
Miss Edith Adams, 24 Howe St., Wellesley, Mass. 1921.
Dr. Louise Elizabeth Whetenhall Adams, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1920.
Pres. Cyrus Adler, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa. (2041 N. Broad St.). 1883.
Miss Miriam C. Akers, Denison University, Granville, O. 1922.
Dean Francis Asbury Alabaster, Nebraska Wesleyan University, University Pl., Nebr. 1921.
Prof. Raymond M. Alden, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1914.
Bernard M. Allen, Cheshire, Conn. 1921.
Prof. Hamilton Ford Allen, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1903.
Harold Douglass Allen, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
Prof. James T. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (37 Mosswood Rd.). 1898.
Miss Jessie E. Allen, Girls' High School, 17th and Spring Garden Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
Prof. Katharine Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (228 Langdon St.). 1899.
Prof. May Alice Allen, Sophie Newcomb Memorial College, Tulane University, New Orleans, La. 1920.
William Henry Allen, 3417 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1917.
Dr. Anne C. E. Allinson, 163 George St., Providence, R. I. (Life member). 1920.
* Prof. Francis G. Allinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (163 George St.). Life member. 1893.
* Prof. Clara Janet Allison, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. 1921.

¹ This list has been corrected up to June 30, 1922. The Secretary begs to be kept informed of all changes of address. Names marked with an asterisk are those of members who attended the Fifty-third Annual Meeting, held in Ann Arbor, Mich., in December, 1921.

* Prof. Andrew Runni Anderson, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1905.

Dr. Florence Mary Bennett Anderson (Mrs. L. F.), 364 Boyer Ave., Walla Walla, Wash. (Life member). 1910.

Prof. Louis Francis Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. (364 Boyer Ave.). 1887.

George Allison Armour, Princeton, N. J. (Life member). 1921.

Prof. Henry H. Armstrong, 825 Park Ave., Beloit, Wis. 1906.

Prof. Mary E. Armstrong, Olivet College, Olivet, Mich. 1921.

Prof. William G. Aurelio, Boston University, Boston, Mass. (102 Charles St.). 1903.

Prof. James Curtiss Austin, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. Harold L. Axtell, University of Idaho, Moscow, Ida. 1922.

Pres. Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 1921.

Prof. C. C. Ayer, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1902.

Prof. Frank Cole Babbitt, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (65 Vernon St.). 1897.

Prof. Earle Brownell Babcock, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1913.

Dean William Frederic Badé, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal. (2616 College Ave.). 1903.

Dr. Lawrence Henry Baker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1920.

Prof. Allan P. Ball, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1905.

Dr. Francis K. Ball, 15 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1894.

Prof. Floyd G. Ballantine, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1903.

* Dr. Susan H. Ballou, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1912.

Cecil K. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. 1898.

Miss Edith Bancroft, 25 Sanborn St., Reading, Mass. 1921.

Prof. Amy L. Barbour, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (234 Crescent St.). 1902.

Louis Barnier, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1589 LeRoy Ave.). 1921.

Prof. LeRoy C. Barret, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1906.

J. Edmund Barss, Loomis Institute, Windsor, Conn. 1897.

Prof. George Lloyd Barton, Jr., Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va. (Drawer 925). 1919.

Prof. Herbert J. Barton, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1907.

Prof. John W. Basore, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1902.

* Prof. Henry Jewell Bassett, Evansville College, Evansville, Ind. 1919.

Prof. Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt. 1903.

Prof. William N. Bates, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (220 St. Mark's Square). 1894.

Prof. William J. Battle, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. (Life member). 1893.

Prof. Paul V. C. Baur, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (166 Edgehill Rd.). 1902.

John W. Beach, 149 Calumet Ave., Aurora, Ill. 1902.
Prof. Edward A. Bechtel, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. 1900.
Prof. Isbon T. Beckwith, Hartford, Conn. 1884.
Prof. Charles H. Beeson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1009 E. 60th St.). 1897.
Prof. Gertrude H. Beggs, Westhampton College, Richmond, Va. 1912.
Prof. A. J. Bell, Victoria University, Toronto, Can. (17 Avenue Rd.). 1887.
Alfred Raymond Bellinger, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (406 Yale Station). 1920.
Prof. Harold H. Bender, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1912.
Prof. Allen R. Benner, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. 1901.
Dr. Harold Bennett, College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C. 1921.
Capt. Paul Benrimo, Bingham Military School, Asheville, N. C. 1921.
Miss M. Julia Bentley, 3517 Middleton Ave., Cincinnati, O. 1920.
Frank May Benton, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. (Adams Hall). 1919.
Prof. George O. Berg, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. 1909.
Pierre Arnold Bernard, Nyack, N. Y. 1913.
Miss Emma L. Berry, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
Prof. Lillian G. Berry, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind. 1916.
Prof. Louis Bevier, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1884.
Dr. John Dean Bickford, Culver Military Academy, Culver, Ind. 1920.
* Prof. Clarence P. Bill, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1894.
Prof. Albert Billheimer, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa. 1912.
* Prof. Arthur Vaughan Bishop, Hollins College, Hollins, Va. 1917.
* Prof. Charles Edward Bishop, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. 1890.
* Prof. Elizabeth L. Bishop, Western College for Women, Oxford, O. 1919.
Mrs. Mary Leal Harkness Black, Panora, Ia. 1921.
Mr. Warren E. Blake, 38 Carleton St., Newton, Mass. 1922.
Dr. Carl W. Blegen, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1920.
Prof. Leonard Bloomfield, 2061 Fairfax Rd., Upper Arlington, Columbus, O. 1914.
Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1882.
Dr. G. Alder Blumer, 196 Blackstone Boul., Providence, R. I. 1921.
* Prof. A. E. R. Boak, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (815 Forest Ave.). Life member. 1920.
Prof. Willis H. Bocock, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1890.
Sister Mary Paschal Boillot, Dominican College, San Rafael, Cal. 1921.
Prof. George M. Bolling, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1897.
Prof. Alexander L. Bonduant, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1892.
* Prof. Campbell Bonner, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1025 Martin Pl.). Life member. 1899.

* Prof. Robert J. Bonner, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1911.
 Prof. Benjamin Parsons Bourland, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1900.
 Dr. Ella Bourne, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1916.
 Prof. Edwin W. Bowen, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1905.
 M. J. Boyer, 603 N. 6th St., Allentown, Pa. 1921.
 Miss Florence C. Brachman, 8439 Germantown Ave., Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. Haven D. Brackett, Clark College, Worcester, Mass. 1905.
 Prof. J. Everett Brady, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (5 Crescent St.). 1891.
 Dr. Joseph Granger Brandt, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans. 1916.
 Dr. Alice F. Bräunlich, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. (2819 Guilford Ave.). 1916.
 Charles Henry Breed, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J. (Woodhull House). 1915.
 Prof. George Sidney Brett, University of Toronto, Toronto, Can. 1920.
 Rev. William A. Brewer, 728 Fairfield Rd., Burlingame, Cal. 1922.
 * Prof. Ethel Hampson Brewster, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. (Life member). 1914.
 Frank Brewster, 75 Ames Building, Boston, Mass. 1920.
 Miss M. Gertrude Bricker, 4723 Baltimore Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Dr. Josiah Bridge, Simsbury, Conn. 1921.
 Dr. Blanche M. E. Brotherton, Wheaton College, Norton, Mass. 1921.
 Christopher George Brouzas, Broaddus College, Philippi, W. Va. 1922.
 Dr. Carroll N. Brown, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (25 Highland Ave., Yonkers). 1908.
 George Brown, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1919.
 Dr. Lester Dorman Brown, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1904.
 Prof. Ruth W. Brown, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal. 1912.
 Mrs. Timothy Brown, 116 E. Gorham St., Madison, Wis. 1920.
 Dr. William Norman Brown, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.
 Prof. Carleton L. Brownson, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1892.
 Dr. W. R. Bryan, American Academy, Rome, Italy. 1921.
 Dr. Arthur Alexis Bryant, De Witt Clinton High School, New York, N. Y. 1921.
 * Prof. Carl D. Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
 Miss Mary H. Buckingham, 96 Chestnut St., Boston, 9, Mass. 1897.
 Dr. Theodore A. Buenger, 621 Addison St., Chicago, Ill. 1915.
 Frank S. Bunnell, 251 Washington St., Norwich, Conn. 1921.
 Prof. Edmund Burke, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1921.
 Prof. Robert B. Burke, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 † Prof. John M. Burnam, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. (Life member). 1899.
 Prof. William S. Burrage, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1898.
 † Died.

- * Prof. Harry E. Burton, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1899.
- * Prof. Orma Fitch Butler, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1109 Forest Ave.) (Life member). 1907.
- Miss Hilda Buttenwieser, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. (Life member). 1921.
- Miss Alice Hill Byrne, Western College, Oxford, O. 1921.
- Sister Marie José Byrne, College of St. Elizabeth, Convent, N. J. 1921.
- Prof. Alva J. Calderwood, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa. 1917.
- Prof. George M. Calhoun, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1056 Euclid Ave.). 1911.
- Prof. T. Callander, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Can. 1919.
- Prof. Donald Cameron, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1905.
- Miss Helen Campion, 800 Logan St., Denver, Colo. (Life member). 1921.
- Prof. Charles B. Cannaday, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. 1922.
- * Prof. Howard Vernon Canter, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. (Champagne, Ill.). 1921.
- Harry Caplan, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (Goldwin Smith Hall, 25). 1920.
- Seth Bunker Capp, Box 2054, Philadelphia, Pa. (Life member). 1914.
- Prof. Edward Capps, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1889.
- Miss Anna L. Carlin, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Prof. Albert J. Carnoy, 50 Rue des Joyeuses Entrées, Louvain, Belgium. 1915.
- * Prof. Rhys Carpenter, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1913.
- * Prof. W. L. Carr, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. (73 S. Cedar Ave.). 1920.
- Prof. Mitchell Carroll, The Octagon, Washington, D. C. 1894.
- Prof. Adam Carruthers, University College, Toronto, Can. 1909.
- Prof. Jane Gray Carter, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Dr. Ernest Cary, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1905.
- William Van Allen Catron, Lexington, Mo. 1896.
- Miss Emma Cauthorn, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1916.
- Prof. Julia H. Caverne, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1902.
- Arnold B. Chace, 99 Power St., Providence, R. I. 1920.
- Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass. (91 Irving St.). 1920.
- Prof. Angie Clara Chapin, 50 Saratoga Ave., Yonkers, N. Y. 1888.
- Prof. Cleveland King Chase, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1911.
- Prof. George Davis Chase, University of Maine, Orono, Me. 1900.
- * Prof. George H. Chase, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (12 Shady Hill Square). 1899.
- Dr. W. H. Chenery, 386 Common St., Belmont, Mass. 1916.
- Arthur S. Chenoweth, Somers Point, N. J. 1921.
- Miss Helen M. Chesnutt, 9719 Lamont Ave., Cleveland, O. 1920.
- Dr. Edward C. Chickering, Jamaica High School, New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Prof. Gilbert Chinard, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1912.

Dr. Ethel L. Chubb, 4209 Chester Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. J. E. Church, Jr., University of Nevada, Reno, Nev. 1922.
 Dr. Edith Frances Claflin, Rosemary Hall, Greenwich, Conn. 1919.
 Prof. Charles Upson Clark, Yale Club, New York, N. Y. 1905.
 Prof. Frank Lowry Clark, Miami University, Oxford, O. 1919.
 Prof. Frederick William Clark, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manit., Can. 1920.
 Prof. Herman A. Clark, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1920.
 Prof. Sereno Burton Clark, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1907.
 Prof. Harold Loomis Cleasby, 805 Comstock Ave., Syracuse, N. Y. 1905.
 Dr. Frank S. Cloud, 4609 W. 12th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.
 Miss Katharine M. Cochran, Ferry Hall, Lake Forest, Ill. 1914.
 Ernest A. Coffin, High School, Hartford, Conn. 1914.
 Dr. Harrison Cadwallader Coffin, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. 1920.
 Dr. George H. Cohen, 120 Capitol Ave., Hartford, Conn. 1914.
 Dr. James Wilfred Cohoon, Mt. Allison University, Sackville, N. B., Can. 1914.
 Prof. Guy Blandin Colburn, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. (Life member). 1911.
 Prof. Charles Nelson Cole, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. 1902.
 Dr. Erma Eloise Cole, Connecticut College for Women, New London, Conn. 1917.
 Prof. Hermann Collitz, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (1027 N. Calvert St.). 1887.
 Pres. William W. Comfort, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1921.
 Miss Ruth Congdon, New Bedford, Mass. 1921.
 Prof. Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del. 1921.
 Prof. Lane Cooper, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1917.
 Prof. William A. Cooper, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.
 Dr. Mario E. Cosenza, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (577 Isham St.). 1908.
 Dr. Cornelia C. Coulter, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1912.
 * Prof. Frank H. Cowles, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1916.
 * Prof. William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1888.
 Prof. J. D. Craig, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Can. 1919.
 Prof. John R. Crawford, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1912.
 Prof. Edmund D. Cressman, University of Denver, Denver, Colo. (2076 S. St. Paul St.). 1914.
 * Prof. Albert R. Crittenden, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (220 Twelfth St.). 1920.
 William Day Crockett, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa. (226 S. Atherton St.). 1915.
 Prof. W. H. Crogman, Clark University, South Atlanta, Ga. 1898.
 Prof. H. L. Crosby, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1909.
 † William L. Cushing, Westminster School, Simsbury, Conn. 1888.

† Died December 11, 1921.

Miss Jean V. N. Da Costa, 1529 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. (Life member).
1921.

Prof. John N. Daland, Milton College, Milton, Wis. 1920.

Alfred Mitchell Dame, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
1911.

Dr. Fritz Sage Darrow, 218 East Ave., Rochester, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. E. W. Davis, Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn. 1921.

Prof. M. E. Davis, Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex. 1920.

Milton C. Davis, Miller Pl., Long Island, N. Y. 1922.

Prof. Henry S. Dawson, D'Youville College, Buffalo, N. Y. (364 West Ave.).
1922.

* Prof. Lindley Richard Dean, Denison University, Granville, O. 1912.

Miss Mildred Dean, 2404 Wisconsin Ave., Washington, D. C. 1920.

* Prof. Sidney N. Deane, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1912.

Dr. Alice A. Deckman, 3236 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Dr. Roy J. Deferrari, Catholic University, Washington, D. C. 1915.

Miss Augusta De Laguna, 5107 Grove St., Oakland, Cal. 1921.

Prof. Robert E. Dengler, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa. 1918.

Holmes Van Mater Dennis, III, Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1921.

Dr. E. B. De Sauzé, Board of Education, Cleveland, O. 1920.

Prof. Monroe E. Deutsch, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2805 Parker St.). 1904.

* Prof. Henry B. Dewing, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (12 Edgehill St.). 1909.

Prof. Norman W. DeWitt, Victoria College, Toronto, Can. 1907.

Prof. Sherwood Owen Dickerman, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
(Life member). 1902.

Prof. Thomas Wyatt Dickson, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 1915.

Miss Eva Dilks, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Dr. George E. Dimock, Jr., 21 Phillips St., Andover, Mass. 1913.

* William Bell Dinsmoor, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1921.

Miss Ellen MacKenzie Dodson, Mills College, Cal. (Box 25). 1921.

Prof. James C. Dolley, McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill. 1920.

* Prof. Benjamin L. D'Ooge, State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. 1895.

Prof. James Walker Downer, Baylor University, Waco, Tex. 1915.

Miss Juanita M. Downes, Cheltenham High School, Elkins Park, Pa. 1921.

Prof. William Prentiss Drew, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. 1907.

Dr. Eleanor Shipley Duckett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (53 Crescent St.). 1914.

* Prof. James E. Dunlap, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. (601 E. University St.). 1921.

Prof. Charles L. Durham, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1906.

Prof. Donald Blythe Durham, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1912.

* Prof. Emily Helen Dutton, Tennessee College, Murfreesboro, Tenn. 1898.

Prof. Herman L. Ebeling, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. (329 Hawthorn Rd., Roland Park). 1892.

Prof. William S. Ebersole, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1893.

Dr. George V. Edwards, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.
(1705 Montgomery Ave.). 1921.

Prof. Katharine M. Edwards, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1893.

* Prof. James C. Egbert, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1889.

Prof. Wallace Stedman Elden, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (1734 Summit St.). 1900.

* Prof. G. W. Elderkin, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1916.

* Dr. Lulu G. Eldridge, Hathaway-Brown School, Cleveland, O. (Life member). 1920.

Prof. W. A. Elliott, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1897.

Willis A. Ellis, Lombard, Ill. 1921.

* Prof. Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1887.

Mrs. Ellinor T. B. Endicott, 404 W. 115th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

* Prof. Robert B. English, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1905.

Prof. George Taylor Ettinger, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 1896.

Miss Catherine A. Everett, 46 Shepard St., Cambridge, Mass. 1921.

Prof. John T. Ewing, Alma College, Alma, Mich. 1922.

Dr. Arthur Fairbanks, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1886.

Prof. Henry Rushton Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.

Prof. Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, San José, Cal. 1919.

William W. Farnam, 335 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. (Life member). 1921.

Miss Elizabeth Faulkner, Faulkner School, 4746 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Life member). 1920.

Frederick P. Fish, 84 State St., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1921.

Prof. James Fulton Ferguson, 47 Orange St., New Haven, Conn. 1914.

Prof. W. S. Ferguson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1899.

Prof. Mervin G. Filler, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1905.

* Prof. George Converse Fiske, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (21 Mendota Ct.). 1900.

Prof. Edward Fitch, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1890.

Prof. Thomas FitzHugh, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. (Life member). 1902.

Prof. Caroline R. Fletcher, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1906.

* Dean Roy C. Flickinger, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (1629 Hinman Ave.). 1905.

Herbert P. Flower, High School, Reedley, Cal. (Box 324). 1921.

Dr. Francis H. Fobes, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. (Life member). 1908.

Maynard D. Follin, Box 118, Detroit, Mich. (Life member). 1922.

Prof. Charles H. Forbes, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. (Life member). 1907.

Prof. Benjamin O. Foster, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1899.

Dr. Emily Foulkrod, 1534 Harrison St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Prof. Frank Hamilton Fowler, University of Arizona, University Station, Tucson, Ariz. 1893.

Prof. Harold North Fowler, College for Women of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (2033 Cornell Rd.) (Life member). 1885.

Miss Susan Fowler, Brearley School, New York, N. Y. (60 E. 61st St.). 1904.

* Prof. William Sherwood Fox, Western University, London, Ont., Can. 1911.

Prof. James Everett Frame, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. Tenney Frank, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (Life member). 1906.

Miss A. Mildred Franklin, Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa. 1921.

Miss Ernestine P. Franklin, 800 N. Chestnut Ave., Williams Bridge, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. Nora Blanding Fraser, Staunton, Va. 1911.

Dr. Walter H. Freeman, Worcester Academy, Worcester, Mass. 1908.

* Prof. A. L. Frothingham, Princeton, N. J. 1914.

Prof. Charles Kelsey Gaines, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. 1890.

Mrs. Marion Possoms Gaines, Box 98, Concord, Cal. 1922.

Prof. John S. Galbraith, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. (Life Member). 1907.

Alexander B. Galt, 2219 California St., Washington, D. C. 1917.

Prof. Robert Max Garrett, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1914.

Dr. Henry S. Gehman, South Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (5720 N. 6th St.). 1914.

Prof. John Lawrence Gerig, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1909.

Judge John Marshall Gest, 542 City Hall, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.

Prof. A. F. Geyser, Campion College, Prairie du Chien, Wis. 1920.

Miss Flora S. Gifford, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1921.

Prin. Seth K. Gifford, Moses Brown School, Providence, R. I. 1891.

Prof. Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1876.

Dr. Walter H. Gillespie, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1908.

Harold Wright Gilmer, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1919.

Ginn & Company, 15 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1921.

Prof. Meta Glass, 601 W. 115th St., New York, N. Y. 1916.

Charles Bertie Gleason, High School, San José, Cal. (456 S. 2d St.). 1900.

Clarence Willard Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass. 1901.

Harold H. Glenn, 4745 Leiper St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Prof. A. E. Gobble, Albright College, Myerstown, Pa. 1921.

Prof. Julius Goebel, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1900.

Prof. Grace G. Goodrich, Ripon College, Ripon, Wis. 1921.

Prof. Charles J. Goodwin, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. (18 E. Church St.). 1891.

* Prof. Florence Alden Gragg, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (234 Crescent St.). 1906.

Dr. Mary A. Grant, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans. (1433 Tennessee St.). 1921.

Prof. Roscoe Allan Grant, Jamaica High School, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y. 1902.
 Dr. William D. Gray, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1907.
 Theodore Francis Green, Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (Life member). 1920.
 Dr. William C. Greene, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (44 Shepard St.). 1915.
 Prof. William Richard Grey, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C. 1920.
 Prof. Alfred Gudeman, Franz Josefstrasse 12, Munich, Germany. 1889.
 Prof. Charles Burton Gulick, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
 Prof. Richard Mott Gummere, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1907.
 Prof. Roy Kenneth Hack, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1910.
 Prof. George D. Hadzsits, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1904.
 Miss E. Adelaide Hahn, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. (640 Riverside Drive). 1917.
 Prof. Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1902.
 Prof. William Gardner Hale, Shippan Point, Stamford, Conn. 1882.
 Prof. Joseph Boyd Haley, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1921.
 Chancellor Frederic A. Hall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (5846 Julian Ave.). 1896.
 P. Russell Hamblin, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1922.
 * Prof. H. A. Hamilton, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. 1895.
 Miss Alice B. Hammond, 130 Wall St., New Haven, Conn. 1921.
 John Calvin Hanna, Department of Public Instruction, Springfield, Ill. 1896.
 Ralph W. Harbison, 1317 Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Life member). 1921.
 William Albert Harbison, 1317 Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Life member). 1921.
 Prof. Caleb R. Harding, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C. 1919.
 Prof. Albert Granger Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1896.
 * Dr. James Penrose Harland, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1116 Forest Ave.) Life member. 1921.
 Dr. Lewis R. Harley, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. Austin Morris Harmon, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (244 Lawrence St.). 1907.
 George McLean Harper, Jr., Princeton, N. J. 1921.
 Prof. Gustave Adolphus Harrer, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1914.
 Dr. Raymond D. Harriman, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1916.
 Prof. Karl P. Harrington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1892.
 Prof. W. A. Harris, University of Richmond, Richmond, Va. 1895.
 Pres. Fairfax Harrison, Southern Railway, Washington, D. C. (Life member). 1914.
 Dr. Carl A. Harström, Harström School, Norwalk, Conn. 1900.
 Prof. Walter Morris Hart, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2255 Piedmont Ave.). 1903.

Dr. Floyd Clayton Harwood, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (492 Yale Station). 1919.

Prof. Harold Ripley Hastings, 146 W. Lanvale St., Baltimore, Md. 1905.

Prof. Adeline Belle Hawes, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1902.

Dr. Edward Southworth Hawes, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, 7th Ave. and 92nd St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1888.

Dr. H. M. Hays, Fenger High School, Chicago, Ill. 1920.

Prof. Charles Baker Hedrick, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. 1913.

Prof. Edward Hoch Heffner, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1917.

Prof. William A. Heidel, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1900.

Prof. F. B. R. Hellems, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1900.

Prof. Clarence Nevin Heller, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1913.

Prof. Otto Heller, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1896.

Prof. George L. Hendrickson, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1892.

Prof. Joseph William Hewitt, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. (31 College Pl.). 1905.

Director Bert Hodge Hill, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece (Life member). 1911.

Miss Helen Fairbanks Hill, 10 Astor St., Lowell, Mass. 1921.

James M. Hill, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Prof. Victor D. Hill, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1920.

* Prof. Robert H. Hiller, Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. (128 E. Madison Ave.). 1920.

Prof. Gertrude M. Hirst, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.

Prof. Helen Elisabeth Hoag, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1907.

Archibald L. Hodges, Wadleigh High School, 114th St., near 7th Ave., New York, N. Y. 1899.

Prof. Arthur Winfred Hodgman, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (206 W. 10th Ave.). 1896.

Prof. Charles Hoeing, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. 1899.

Prof. Horace A. Hoffman, 1916 Valentine Ave., New York, N. Y. 1893.

Prof. John Emory Hollingsworth, Washburn College, Topeka, Kans. (1258 Lane St.). 1921.

Benjamin Clark Holtzclaw, Jr., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (306 Eddy St.). 1921.

Prof. Clara A. Holtzhauser, Oxford College, Oxford, O. 1917.

Prof. W. D. Hooper, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1894.

Prof. E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (299 Lawrence St.). 1883.

Prof. Joseph Clark Hoppin, 310 Sears Bldg., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1900.

Prof. Robert C. Horn, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 1909.

Prof. Albert A. Howard, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (12 Walker St.).
Life member. 1892.

Prof. Joseph Henry Howard, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak. (216 Pine St.). 1921.

Prof. George Howe, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1914.

Prof. Arthur W. Howes, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1918.

Prof. George Edwin Howes, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. (Life member). 1896.

Prof. Harry M. Hubbell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (268 Willow St.). 1911.

Prof. Milton W. Humphreys, University, Va. 1871.

Prof. Richard Wellington Husband, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1907.

Dr. George B. Hussey, Wilson Ave., Maryville, Tenn. 1887.

Miss M. Agnes Hutchinson, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (4511 Locust St.). 1921.

Prof. Mark E. Hutchinson, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va. 1921.

Prin. Maurice Hutton, University College, Toronto, Can. 1908.

Prof. Walter Woodburn Hyde, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1911.

Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1884.

Prof. Carl Newell Jackson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (25 Beck Hall). Life member. 1905.

Prof. M. W. Jacobus, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1893.

Prof. Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (113 Walker St.). 1882.

Prof. Thomas Atkinson Jenkins, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1921.

Thornton Jenkins, High School, Malden, Mass. 1922.

Prof. Allan Chester Johnson, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1912.

Dr. Edwin Lee Johnson, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (3615 West-brook Ave.). 1911.

Franklin Plotinus Johnson, Thomas M. Johnson Library, Osceola, Mo. 1922.

* Prof. Harriet Dale Johnson, Denison University, Granville, O. 1920.

Martin L. Johnson, 1934 Hamilton St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

William H. Johnson, 710 Franklin Ave., Columbus, O. 1895.

Prof. Eva Johnston, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.

* Prof. Richard O. Jolliffe, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Can. 1920.

Prof. Horace L. Jones, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1908.

Prof. Richard Foster Jones, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1922.

Prof. Clinton K. Judy, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Cal. 1915.

* Prof. Arthur Leslie Keith, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1914.

Miss Ruth E. Keller, 568 S. Champion Ave., Columbus, O. 1921.

Prof. George Dwight Kellogg, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. 1897.

Prof. Robert James Kellogg, Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla. 1912.

* Prof. Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1890.

Prof. Roland G. Kent, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (College Hall). Life member. 1903.

J. A. Kerns, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 1921.

Prof. David Martin Key, Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss. 1917.

Dr. Clinton Walker Keyes, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (404 W. 115th St.). 1914.

Prof. David R. Keys, University College, Toronto, Can. 1908.

Prof. William E. Kirk, Willamette University, Salem, Ore. (1450 State St.). 1920.

Prof. William Hamilton Kirk, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1898.

Prof. John C. Kirtland, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1895.

Prof. Robert Christian Kissling, Southeast Missouri State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau, Mo. 1920.

Prof. George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (8 Hil- liard St.). 1884.

* Prof. James A. Kleist, St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, O. 1920.

Prof. Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (1737 Sedgwick Ave.). 1892.

Prof. Fred A. Knapp, Bates College, Lewiston, Me. 1920.

Prof. Raymond Henry Lacey, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill. (130 S. Dia- mond St.). 1915.

* Prof. Gordon J. Laing, McGill University, Montreal, Can. 1907.

Prof. A. G. Laird, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (130 Prospect Ave.). Life member. 1890.

Dr. George A. Land, Merchantville, N. J. 1914.

Prof. Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Farrar St.). 1877.

Lewis H. Lapham, 17 Battery Pl., New York, N. Y. 1880.

* Prof. Helen Hull Law, Meredith College, Raleigh, N. C. 1920.

Miss Lillian B. Lawler, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. (13 N. Madi- son Ave.). 1921.

Dr. Arthur G. Leacock, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1899.

Prof. Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (889 St. Nicholas Ave.). 1895.

* Prof. David Russell Lee, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. (505 Main Ave., W.). 1907.

Miss Mary S. Lee, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Miss Sylvia Lee, The Ludlow, Copley Square, Boston, Mass. 1921.

Dr. Earnest Linwood Lehman, University of Virginia, University, Va. 1919.

Prof. Winfred G. Leutner, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1905.

Miss Lotta B. Liebmann, 11721 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, O. 1920.

Prof. Herbert C. Lipscomb, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va. 1909.

Dr. Henry Wheatland Litchfield, Pembroke, Mass. 1912.

* Prof. Charles Edgar Little, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn. 1902.
 * Prof. Dean P. Lockwood, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1909.
 Prof. Gonzalez Lodge, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1888.
 Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Nahant, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
 Prof. John Oscar Lofberg, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1919.
 Prof. O. F. Long, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (Life member). 1900.
 Prof. Christopher Longest, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1913.
 * Prof. Louis E. Lord, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. 1910.
 Elford Floyd Lounsbury, Tilton Seminary, Tilton, N. H. 1920.
 Dr. D. O. S. Lowell, South Hanson, Mass. 1894.
 Prof. John L. Lowes, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1916.
 Rev. William Ludwig, Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y. 1921.
 Miss Katharine Lummis, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va. 1920.
 Dr. F. B. Lund, 257 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
 Dr. Elizabeth Perkins Lyders (Mrs.), 2429 Green St., San Francisco, Cal. 1904.
 Miss Caroline Vinia Lynch, 217 Norfolk St., Dorchester Centre, Boston, Mass. 1914.
 * Dr. Eugene S. McCartney, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1920.
 Prof. Chester C. McCown, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal. (Box 59). 1920.
 Prof. Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1890.
 * Prof. Walton Brooks McDaniel, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (College Hall). 1901.
 Prof. J. H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1871.
 Miss Cecelia Baldwin McElroy, 668 Irving Park Boul., Chicago, Ill. (Life member). 1914.
 Prof. Mary B. McElwain, Gillett House, Northampton, Mass. 1908.
 Dr. Charles W. Macfarlane, Ritz-Carlton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa. 1914.
 Mrs. Ida Kruse MacFarlane, University of Denver, Denver, Colo. (Life member). 1921.
 Mrs. Isabella T. Machan, 854 W. Williams St., Decatur, Ill. 1921.
 Pres. A. St. Clair Mackenzie, 437 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1901.
 Prof. Arthur P. McKinlay, University of California, Southern Branch, Los Angeles, Cal. 1913.
 Miss Harriett E. McKinstry, Lake Erie College, Painesville, O. 1881.
 Dr. Charlotte F. McLean, Schuylkill Seminary, Reading, Pa. 1906.
 Pres. George E. MacLean, 50 Russell Square, London, W. C., 1, England. 1891.
 Prof. James Sugars McLemore, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1912.
 Dr. Robert Cecil MacMahon, 78 W. 55th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
 Prof. Grace Harriet Macurdy, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1894.
 Dr. Anna Pearl MacVay, Wadleigh High School, New York, N. Y. 1918.
 Prof. Ashton Waugh McWhorter, Hampden-Sidney College, Hampden-Sidney, Va. 1909.

Robert L. McWhorter, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1906.
Prof. David Magie, Jr., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (101 Library Pl.).
1901.
Prof. Joseph S. Magnuson, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1920.
Prof. Ralph Van Deman Magoffin, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
1908.
Dr. Herbert W. Magoun, 70 Kirkland St., Cambridge, Mass. 1891.
Prof. John M. Manly, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1896.
Dr. Clarence Augustus Manning, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
1915.
Prof. Richard Clarke Manning, Kenyon College, Gambier, O. 1905.
Prof. Allan Marquand, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
Miss Ellen F. Mason, Rhode Island Ave., Newport, R. I. 1885.
Dr. Maurice W. Mather, 41 Dana St., Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
Paul Mayo, University of Denver, Denver, Colo. (Life member). 1921.
Prof. Thomas Means, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. (267 Maine St.).
1921.
Prof. Henrietta Josephine Meeteer, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 1920.
* Prof. Bruno Meinecke, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1921.
* Prof. Clarence W. Mendell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1908.
. Prof. Frank Ivan Merchant, Iowa State Teachers' College, Cedar Falls, Ia. (1927
College St.) Life member. 1898.
Prof. Elmer Truesdell Merrill, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1883.
Prof. William A. Merrill, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2609 Col-
lege Ave.). 1886.
Miss Ruth E. Messenger, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. (853 St. Nicholas
Ave.). 1920.
Prof. William Stuart Messer, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1915.
Eugene Meyer, Jr., 820 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.
Dr. Truman Michelson, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. 1900.
Prof. Charles Christopher Mierow, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.
(216 E. Espanola St.). 1909.
Herbert Edward Mierow, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo. 1914.
Prof. Alfred William Milden, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1903.
Dr. A. Bertha Miller, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1915.
* Prof. C. W. E. Miller, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1892.
Prof. Frank Justus Miller, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1920.
Prof. Theodore A. Miller, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (18 Sibley
Pl.). 1915.
Prof. Walter Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1900.
Knower Mills, Loomis Institute, Windsor, Conn. 1919.
Prof. B. W. Mitchell, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (4326 Pine St.).
1921.
Samuel L. Mohler, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (Life mem-
ber). 1921.
Prof. Clifford Herschel Moore, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (112
Brattle St.). Life member. 1889.

Prof. Frank Gardner Moore, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1888.
 Prof. J. Leverett Moore, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1887.
 Prof. Paul G. Moorhead, 5742 Kenwood Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1920.
 Paul E. More, 245 Nassau St., Princeton, N. J. 1896.
 Prof. Edward P. Morris, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (53 Edgehill Rd.).
 1886.
 Nicholas Moseley, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1921.
 Prof. Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1898.
 Prof. Omer Hillman Mott, Belmont Abbey, Belmont, N. C. 1921.
 * Dr. Clyde Murley, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (Fisk Hall, 2).
 1920.
 Dr. E. J. Murphy, Division Superintendent of Schools, Lingayen, Pangasinan,
 P. I. 1900.
 Prof. Augustus Tabor Murray, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford
 University, Cal. (Box 112). 1887.
 Prof. E. W. Murray, 17 S. William St., New York, N. Y. 1907.
 Prof. John Scott Murray, Furman University, Greenville, S. C. (428 University
 Ridge). 1920.
 Prof. Wilfred P. Mustard, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1892.
 Walter N. Myers, Sellersville, Pa. 1921.
 Dr. Royal C. Nemiah, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1919.
 * Prof. K. P. R. Neville, Western University, London, Can. 1902.
 Prof. Charles B. Newcomer, 1083 27th St., Des Moines, Ia. (Life member).
 1900.
 Prof. Barker Newhall, Kenyon College, Gambier, O. 1891.
 Dr. Samuel Hart Newhall, 337 Orchard Lane, Highland Park, Ill. 1913.
 Prof. Eva May Newman, Rockford College, Rockford, Ill. (Box 25). 1922.
 Dr. Edward Wilber Nichols, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N. S., Can. 1915.
 John D. Nicholson, Jacksonville, Tex. 1918.
 Dean Paul Nixon, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1907.
 Prof. Jonas O. Notestein, College of Wooster, Wooster, O. 1919.
 Prof. H. C. Nutting, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (Box 172). 1900.
 Prof. Irene Nye, Connecticut College for Women, New London, Conn. 1911.
 Prof. Caroline H. Ober, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1914.
 Dr. Margaret Brown O'Connor, 3702-a Page Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1916.
 Dr. Charles J. Ogden, 628 W. 114th St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
 Prof. C. H. Oldfather, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1919.
 * Prof. William Abbott Oldfather, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. (804 W.
 Green St.). 1908.
 Prof. Samuel Grant Oliphant, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa. 1907.
 Dr. John R. Oliver, Latrobe Apartments, Baltimore, Md. 1922.
 Dr. Louis Ottofy, 121 E. 18th St. Chicago, Ill. 1922.
 Prof. W. H. Oxtoby, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Cal.
 1914.
 Henry Gallup Paine, 1 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 1919.
 Prof. Walter Hobart Palmer, Branford, Conn. 1914.
 Henry Spackman Pancoast, Spring Lane, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. 1914.

Dean Marian Edwards Park, Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass. 1921.
Prof. Clarence Paschall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2800 Derby St.). 1903.
Prof. James M. Paton, care of Morgan, Harjes & Co., 14 Place Vendôme, Paris, France. 1887.
Thomas Patterson, 1712 Oliver Building, Pittsburg, Pa. (Life member). 1921.
* Dr. Adolf Frederick Pauli, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1921.
Miss Jessie Kirkland Paxton, High School, Santa Ana, Cal. (111 S. Ross St.). 1922.
Harry F. Payer, 538 East Ohio Gas Building, Cleveland, O. (Life member). 1921.
Dr. Charles Peabody, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (197 Brattle St.). 1894.
Dr. Mary Bradford Peaks, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1905.
Dr. Joseph Pearl, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1921.
* Prof. Arthur Stanley Pease, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1906.
† Prof. Tracy Peck, Boston Hotel, Rome, Italy. 1871.
Dr. William T. Peck, 48 Princeton Ave., Providence, R. I. 1920.
Prof. Daniel A. Penick, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1902.
Provost Joseph H. Penniman, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (Life member). 1921.
Hon. George Wharton Pepper, Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
Prof. Charles W. Peppler, Trinity College, Durham, N. C. 1899.
Prof. Emma M. Perkins, College for Women of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1892.
* Dr. Ben Edwin Perry, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. (8 School St.). 1920.
Prof. Edward D. Perry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1882.
Prin. Lewis Perry, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1914.
Prof. Walter Petersen, Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. 1913.
Prof. Torsten Petersson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2215 Marin Ave.). 1905.
* Prof. Clyde Pharr, Southwestern Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tenn. 1912.
Dr. Aristides E. Phoutrides, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1915.
Miss Elizabeth D. Pierce, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1916.
Prof. Annie M. Pitman, 414 N. Henry St., Madison, Wis. 1921.
† Prof. Samuel Ball Platner, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (1961 Ford Drive). 1885.
George A. Plimpton, 61 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1916.
Alfred E. Porter, 674 Winthrop Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1921.
Prof. Chandler Rathfon Post, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1920.
Prof. Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1886.
L. Arnold Post, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1921.
Prof. Hubert McNeill Poteat, Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C. 1911.

† Died November, 1921.

‡ Died August 20, 1921.

Prof. Franklin H. Potter, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1898.
Henry Preble, 154 E. 91st St., New York, N. Y. 1882.
Prof. William Kelly Prentice, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (Life member). 1895.
* Prof. Henry W. Prescott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1899.
Dr. Keith Preston, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1914.
Prof. Clifton Price, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (23 Panoramic Way). 1899.
Dr. Helen Price, Hood College, Frederick, Md. 1921.
Dr. Lester M. Prindle, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt. (Life member). 1921.
Dr. G. Payn Quackenbos, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1921.
Mrs. Eliza G. Radeke, 92 Prospect St., Providence, R. I. (Life member). 1921.
Prof. Robert S. Radford, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. (521 Walnut St.). 1900.
* Prof. Edward Kennard Rand, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (107 Lake View Ave.). Life member. 1902.
Prof. Charles B. Randolph, Clark College, Worcester, Mass. 1905.
Prof. Edwin Moore Rankin, Claremont Inn, Claremont, Cal. 1905.
Miss Ruth E. Razee, 137 Alden Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1921.
Prof. John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky. 1885.
Samuel Macon Reed, Brevard, N. C. 1922.
Prof. Katharine C. Reiley, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1912.
Prof. Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (85 Trumbull St.). 1884.
Prof. Alexander H. Rice, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1909.
Miss Edith F. Rice, Germantown High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
Prof. Leon J. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2415 College Ave.). 1895.
Prof. Mary Lilius Richardson, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (36 Bedford Terrace). 1917.
Prof. Ernest H. Riedel, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. 1908.
Dr. Ernst Riess, Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (221 W. 113th St., New York). 1895.
Joaquin Palomo Rincon, Ava. Uruguay 45, Mexico, D. F., Mexico. 1912.
Alfred L. Ripley, Andover, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
Miss Dorothy M. Robathan, Walnut Hill School, Natick, Mass. 1921.
Prof. Edmund Y. Robbins, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.
* Dr. Frank Egleston Robbins, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (Life member). 1912.
Harley F. Roberts, Taft School, Watertown, Conn. 1921.
Harold C. Roberts, Tulpehocken and Greene Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
Prof. Archibald Thomas Robertson, Southern Bapt. Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky. 1909.

Prof. John Cunningham Robertson, 423 W. 22d St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
* Prof. David M. Robinson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (Life member). 1905.
Prof. Dwight Nelson Robinson, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O. 1911.
Fletcher Nichols Robinson, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1909.
Dr. James J. Robinson, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1902.
Dr. Rodney Potter Robinson, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1920.
Prof. Joseph C. Rockwell, Municipal University of Akron, Akron, O. 1896.
* Miss Dorothy M. Roehm, 3319 Hogarth Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1921.
Robert Samuel Rogers, Madison, N. J. (Life member). 1921.
Prof. John Carew Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.
Dean Florence K. Root, Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1919.
Miss Mabel V. Root, Catskill, N. Y. 1920.
Ruskin R. Rosborough, Box 834, De Land, Fla. 1920.
Prof. Clarence F. Ross, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1902.
Miss Adele M. Roth, College of the Pacific, San Jose, Cal. 1922.
Martin L. Rouse, 25 Westdown Rd., Catford, S. E. 6, London, England. 1908.
* Prof. A. M. Rovelstad, Luther College, Decorah, Ia. (206 Ohio St.). 1921.
Prof. William T. Rowland, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1919.
Prof. August Rupp, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1902.
William Sener Rusk, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1921.
Prof. P. W. Russell, Biddle University, Charlotte, N. C. 1920.
Thomas De Coursey Ruth, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C. 1914.
Prof. H. Osborne Ryder, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn. 1922.
* Prof. Frances E. Sabin, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1920.
Prof. Julius Sachs, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (The Belmont, 86th St. and Broadway). 1875.
Prof. Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. (3138 Avalon St.). Life member. 1912.
* Prof. Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (521 Thompson St.). 1899.
Prof. Frederick W. Sanford, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr. 1922.
Prof. Myron R. Sanford, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1894.
Henry B. Sargent, 247 Church St., New Haven, Conn. (Life member). 1921.
Lt. Col. Winthrop Sargent, Jr., Haverford, Pa. 1909.
Prof. Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. (Life member). 1900.
John Alexander Sawhill, Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1921.
Pres. W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O. 1882.
Prof. John Nevin Schaeffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1921.
Prof. Felix E. Schelling, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (4107 Pine St.). 1921.
Prof. Hugo Karl Schilling, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (822 Men-
docino Ave.). 1920.

Alfred Cary Schlesinger, Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1922.
 Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1914.
 Ellis Schnabel, North East High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. D. T. Schoonover, Marietta College, Marietta, O. 1912.
 Prof. Robert Maxwell Scoon, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1914.
 Dr. Charles P. G. Scott, 49 Arthur St., Yonkers, N. Y. 1880.
 Prof. Harry Fletcher Scott, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1921.
 * Prof. John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (1958 Sheridan Rd.). 1898.
 * Prof. R. Walker Scott, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. Henry S. Scribner, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1045 Murray Hill Ave.). Life member. 1889.
 Prof. Helen M. Searles, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1893.
 Miss Laura Seguine, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Dr. Lewis L. Sell, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (240 W. 122d St.). 1916.
 Prof. William Tunstall Semple, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. (315 Pike St.). Life member. 1910.
 Prof. Joachim Henry Senger, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1321 Bay View Pl.). 1900.
 Miss Mary E. Shaneman, Birdsboro, Berks Co., Pa. 1922.
 Dr. T. Leslie Shear, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (211 N. Broadway, Yonkers). Life member. 1906.
 Miss Caroline Sheldon, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia. 1922.
 Prof. Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (39 Kirkland St.). 1881.
 Dr. Henry V. Shelley, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1919.
 C. Sidney Shepard, New Haven, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.
 Prof. William P. Shepard, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1922.
 Prof. Charles L. Sherman, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O. (125 N. Sandusky St.). 1921.
 * Prof. L. R. Shero, St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. 1921.
 Dr. Emily L. Shields, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (36 Bedford Ter.). 1909.
 * Prof. F. W. Shipley, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1900.
 Prof. Paul Shorey, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
 Prof. Grant Showerman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (410 N. Butler St.). 1900.
 Prof. Thomas K. Sidey, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1914.
 Prof. E. G. Sihler, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1876.
 Pres. Kenneth C. M. Sills, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1906.
 Miss Adelaide Douglas Simpson, University of Virginia, University, Va.
 Prof. S. B. Slack, McGill University, Montreal, Can. 1920.

* Prof. Moses Stephen Slaughter, 633 Francis St., Madison, Wis. (Life member).
1887.

William Sloane, 689 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.

Prof. Charles N. Smiley, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia. 1907.

Miss Elizabeth F. Smiley, 501 E. Gordon St., Marshall, Mo. 1922.

Prof. Charles Forster Smith, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (1715 Kendall Ave.). 1883.

Charles H. Smith, Morristown School, Morristown, N. J. 1919.

Prof. Charles S. Smith, George Washington University, Washington, D. C. 1895.

Dr. Gertrude E. Smith, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1922.

Prof. Harry de Forest Smith, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1899.

Prof. Kendall Kerfoot Smith, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1910.

Prof. Lillian S. Smith, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga. 1919.

Dr. R. Morris Smith, Wittenberg Academy, Springfield, O. (280 W. Cecil St.). 1920.

Dr. Stanley Barney Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (1474 Belmont Ave.) 1921.

William F. Smith, 25 Weld Hall, Cambridge, Mass. 1922.

Prof. Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (15 Elmwood Ave.). Life member. 1886.

Prof. Thomas Henry Sonnedecker, Heidelberg University, Tiffin, O. 1919.

Prof. W. G. Spencer, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind. 1921.

Miss Evelyn Spring, Bradford Academy, Bradford, Mass. 1917.

Dr. Sidney G. Stacey, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (177 Woodruff Ave.). 1901.

John B. Stearns, Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1922.

Prof. R. B. Steele, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (101 24th Ave. S.). Life member. 1893.

Prof. Charles P. Steinmetz, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.

Prof. Guido Stempel, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. (723 S. Park Ave.). 1921.

Prof. Rufus T. Stephenson, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1910.

* Prof. James Sterenberg, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. 1910.

* Prof. Manson A. Stewart, Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak. 1909.

Prof. Francis H. Stoddard, 22 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1890.

Charles W. Stone, 488 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1921.

Prof. Alvin H. M. Stonecipher, Indiana Central University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1914.

* Prof. S. E. Stout, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. 1915.

Prof. Frederick Eugene Stratton, Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak. 1919.

Dr. Robert P. Strickler, Kingwood, W. Va. 1911.

Prof. Donald Clive Stuart, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1916.

Prof. Duane Reed Stuart, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1901.

Mrs. Anne B. B. Sturgis, Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1920.

S. Warren Sturgis, Groton, Mass. 1921.

Albert Morey Sturtevant, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans. (924 La. St.). 1922.

Dr. Edgar Howard Sturtevant, 28 Myrtle Ave., Edgewater, N. J. 1901.

Dr. Mary Hamilton Swindler, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1912.

* Prof. Rollin Harvelle Tanner, Denison University, Granville, O. (Box 485). Life member. 1911.

Prof. Helen H. Tanzer, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1910.

Prof. John S. P. Tatlock, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1915.

Prof. Eugene Tavenner, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (McMillan Hall). 1912.

Prof. Archer Taylor, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1920.

Gilbert H. Taylor, Palmer College, Albany, Mo. 1922.

* Prof. John W. Taylor, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manit., Can. 1919.

Prof. Lily Ross Taylor, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1912.

Prof. Susan D. Tew, Sophie Newcomb Memorial College, Tulane University, New Orleans, La. 1919.

Prof. Ida Carleton Thallon, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1915.

Boyce A. Thomas, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.

Pres. M. Carey Thomas, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1921.

Prof. Clara Louise Thompson, Shorter College, Rome, Ga. 1920.

Russell I. Thompson, Dickinson Seminary, Williamsport, Pa. 1922.

Dean David Thomson, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1902.

Prof. George R. Throop, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1907.

Dr. Charles H. Thurber, 15 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass. 1901.

Prof. Henry A. Todd, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1887.

Prof. Herbert Cushing Tolman, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1889.

Miss Lena B. Tomson, Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis. 1921.

Prof. Catherine Torrance, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga. 1920.

Prof. J. A. Tufts, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1898.

Miss Elizabeth McJimsey Tyng, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. (430 W. 119th St., New York). 1916.

* Prof. B. L. Ullman, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. (Life member). 1910.

Prof. Harry Brown Van Deventer, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1907.

Prof. Justin Loomis Van Gundy, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill. 1920.

Prof. Henry Bartlett Van Hoesen, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1909.

Prof. La Rue Van Hook, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1905.

Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (121 High St.). 1869.

Miss Susan E. Van Wert, Hunter High School, New York, N. Y. (316 W. 112th St.). 1914.

Prof. Agnes Carr Vaughan, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1917.

Prof. N. P. Vlachos, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.

Prof. Frank Vogel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.
1904.

J. Homer Wade, 3903 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, O. (Life member). 1921.

Dr. Anthony Pelzer Wagener, Roanoke College, Salem, Va. 1911.

Prof. W. H. Wait, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1893.

Miss Mary Violet Waite, 402 Eddy St., Ithaca, N. Y. 1908.

Prof. Margaret C. Waites, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
1910.

Dr. John W. H. Walden, 7 Irving Terrace, Cambridge, Mass. 1889.

G. Byron Waldrop, Westminster School, Simsbury, Conn. 1921.

Prof. Arthur Tappan Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans. 1895.

Prof. Alice Walton, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1894.

Prof. William D. Ward, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal. 1912.

James R. Ware, 1709 Fillmore St., Camden, N. J. (Life member). 1921.

Miss Henrietta M. Washburn, 317 S. 11th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Miss Florence Waterman, Winsor School, Boston, Mass. 1921.

Prof. William E. Waters, New York University, University Heights, N. Y.
1885.

Prof. John C. Watson, 6216 Wayne Ave., Edgewater Station, Chicago, Ill.
1902.

Prof. Robert Henning Webb, University of Virginia, University, Va. 1909.

Prof. Hermann J. Weber, Berkeley, Cal. (1811 La Loma Ave.). 1913.

Prof. Shirley H. Weber, 106 Broadmead, Princeton, N. J. 1914.

Dr. Helen L. Webster, National Cathedral School, Washington, D. C. 1890.

Prof. Raymond Weeks, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.

Dr. Herbert T. Weiskotten, Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y. 1919.

Prof. Charles Heald Weller, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1903.

Louis C. West, 706 Citizens Building, Cleveland, O. (Life member). 1921.

Prof. J. H. Westcott, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.

Prof. Arthur Harold Weston, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis. (619 Washington St.). 1915.

Prof. Monroe Nichols Wetmore, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. (Life member). 1906.

Prof. Arthur Leslie Wheeler, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. (221 Roberts Rd.). 1899.

President-Emeritus Benjamin Ide Wheeler, University of California, Berkeley Cal. (2425 Ridge Rd.). 1879.

Benjamin Webb Wheeler, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2425 Ridge Rd.). 1920.

Prof. George Meason Whicher, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. 1891.

Dr. Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (424 Dryden Rd.). 1886.

Howell North White, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1921.

Prof. John B. White, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. 1920.

John G. White, Williamson Building, Cleveland, Ohio. 1922.

Prof. Raymond H. White, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1911.

Dr. Philip B. Whitehead, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1920.

Miss Mabel K. Whiteside, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va. 1906.

Prof. Edward A. Wicher, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Cal. 1906.

Dr. Alfred Reynolds Wightman, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. (84 Front St.). 1920.

* Prof. Henry D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. (Life member). 1898.

Prof. Eliza G. Wilkins, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1917.

Mrs. Caroline Ransom Williams, Chesbrough Dwellings, Toledo, O. 1922.

Charles Richards Williams, Benedict House, Princeton, N. J. 1887.

Prof. Edward Thomas Williams, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1410 Scenic Ave.) 1919.

Prof. Mary G. Williams, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1899.

E. R. B. Willis, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1914.

Dr. Gwendolen B. Willis, Bryn Mawr School, Baltimore, Md. 1906.

Harold R. Willoughby, 130 South Divinity Hall, Chicago, Ill. 1915.

Prof. Margaret B. Wilson, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.

Dr. Pearl Cleveland Wilson, Miss Chandor's School, New York, N. Y. (65 Morningside Ave.). 1919.

Prof. William Jerome Wilson, State Normal School, Cheney, Wash. 1918.

Prof. Herbert Wing, Jr., Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. (429 W. South St.). 1915.

Prof. John Garrett Winter, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (Life member). 1906.

Prof. Boyd Ashby Wise, Stephens City, Va. 1909.

H. Rey Wolf, Lower Merion High School, Ardmore, Pa. (16 School Lane). 1921.

Prof. William Dudley Woodhead, University of Toronto, Toronto, Can. 1920.

* Prof. Willis Patten Woodman, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. (808 Main St.). 1901.

Prof. Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1887.

* Prof. F. Warren Wright, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1910.

Dr. Horace Wetherill Wright, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 1918.

Dr. William Frank Wyatt, 120 Packard Ave., Tufts College, 57, Mass. 1915.

Prof. Herbert H. Yeames, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1906.

Mrs. Helen D. Yetter, Perrenoud Apartments, Denver, Colo. (Life member). 1921.

Prof. Clarence H. Young, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (312 W. 88th St.). 1890.

Dr. Charles Hamline Zimmerman, 155 Elm St., New Haven, Conn. 1920.

Members in the above list,	821
Members not in the above list (from the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast),	7
Total,	<hr/> 828

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION¹

ARTICLE I.—NAME AND OBJECT

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."
2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II.—OFFICERS

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.
2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.
3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.
4. An Assistant Secretary, and an Assistant Treasurer, may be elected at the first session of each annual meeting, on the nomination of the Secretary and the Treasurer respectively.

ARTICLE III.—MEETINGS

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.
2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.
3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.
4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

ARTICLE IV.—MEMBERS

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.

¹ As amended December 28, 1907.

2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V.—SUNDRIES

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI.—AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

COMMITTEES AND BUSINESS MATTERS

1. NOMINATING COMMITTEE, established July 8, 1903 (xxxiv, xix, xlvi). One member retires each year after five years of service, and is replaced by a successor named by the President of the Association. The present membership of the Committee is as follows:—

Professor John A. Scott.
Professor Carl D. Buck.
Professor Frank G. Moore.
Professor Frank Frost Abbott.
Professor Clifford H. Moore.

2. COMMITTEE ON GRAMMATICAL NOMENCLATURE (representing the Association on the Joint Committee), appointed in 1911 (xlII, xii), and continued at the subsequent meetings:—

Professor John C. Kirtland.
† Professor Benjamin L. Bowen.
Professor Hermann Collitz.
Professor Walter Miller.
Dr. Sidney G. Stacey.

3. PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST. The present terms of affiliation between this Association and the American Philological Association are defined in the Articles of Agreement adopted by the two Associations in December, 1916 (xlVII, xi f.), and November, 1917 (xlVIII, xiv), respectively.

4. SALARY OF THE SECRETARY AND TREASURER. In December, 1921, the Association voted to authorize the Executive Committee to give the Secretary and Treasurer an allowance for clerical help, of such amount as it deems proper, in addition to his salary of \$350 (lII, xv). For the year 1922 the Committee allowed for this purpose an amount not to exceed \$200.

5. PUBLICATION. By vote of the Association (December, 1919), the publication of the annual volume was put in charge of the Secretary (l, xi).

6. VETERAN MEMBERS. On December 29, 1911, the Executive Committee voted that it be the practice of the Committee to relieve from the payment of further dues members of thirty-five years standing, who have reached the age of sixty-five.

7. LIFE MEMBERSHIPS. On December 31, 1914, it was voted by the Association that the Treasurer be instructed to fund all sums received for life memberships (xlV, xiv).

† Died.

lxvii

8. LAPSE OF MEMBERSHIP. On December 29, 1917, by vote of the Association, Art. iv, Sec. 3 of the Constitution, long neglected, was again put in force. Membership therefore ceases automatically after failure in the payment of the annual fee for two years (XLVIII, x).

9. By vote of the Association (December 28, 1918), no member is entitled to receive the annual volume unless he has paid the dues for the year for which the volume is issued (XLIX, vii).

10. AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES. On December 31, 1919, the Association declared its adherence to the American Council of Learned Societies, a member of the Union Académique International (L, ix-x). The delegates of the Association to the Council are Professors Frank G. Moore and William K. Prentice.

11. The Association elects annually a delegate to the Council of the American Classical League (XLIX, viii). The delegate for 1922 is Professor W. B. McDaniel.

12. ENDOWMENT COMMITTEE, established December 31, 1919 (L, xi) :—

Fairfax Harrison, <i>Chairman.</i>	Principal Maurice Hutton.
G. A. Plimpton, <i>Treasurer.</i>	Professor John M. Manly.
Professor Clarence P. Bill, <i>Secretary.</i>	Professor Clifford H. Moore.
† Professor Charles E. Bennett.	Professor Frank G. Moore.
Dr. Arthur Fairbanks.	Dr. Paul Elmer More.
Professor B. L. Gildersleeve.	Professor John C. Rolfe.
Professor G. L. Hendrickson.	Professor Paul Shorey.
	Professor Herbert Weir Smyth.

13. COMMITTEE ON AN INTERNATIONAL AUXILIARY LANGUAGE, appointed December 30, 1920 (LI, xii) :—

Professor W. A. Oldfather.	Professor Dean P. Lockwood.
Professor Carl D. Buck.	Professor Clarence W. Mendell.
Professor Roland G. Kent.	Professor H. P. Nutting.
	Professor L. J. Paetow.

† Died May 2, 1921.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION

THE annually published *Proceedings* of the American Philological Association contain, in their present form, the programme and minutes of the annual meeting, brief abstracts of papers read, a record of the publications of members of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published *Transactions* give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The *Proceedings* are bound with them.

For the contents of Volumes I-XXXIV inclusive, see Volume XXXIV, pp. cxliii ff.; for XXXV-XLVII, Volume XLVII, pp. lxxxviii ff. The contents of Volumes XLVIII-LI are as follows :

1917—Volume XLVIII

Stuart, D. R.: Petrarch's indebtedness to the *libellus* of Catullus.
Moore, C. H.: The decay of nationalism under the Roman Empire.
Hewitt, J. W.: Some aspects of the treatment of ingratitude in Greek and English literature.
Sturtevant, E. H.: *Tenuis and media*.
Bradley, C. B.: The history of the Sukhōthai letters.
Carnoy, A. J.: The predicating sentence.
Bassett, S. E.: The hepthemimeral caesura in Greek hexameter poetry.
Ullman, B. L.: Horace on the nature of satire.
Lanman, C. R.: Hindu ascetics and their powers.
Proceedings of the forty-ninth annual meeting, Philadelphia, Pa., 1917.
Proceedings of the nineteenth annual meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., 1917.

1918—Volume XLIX

Pease, A. S.: On the authenticity of the *Hercules Oetaeus*.
Flickinger, R. C.: The accusative of exclamation: Lucretius to Ovid.
Bassett, S. E.: The suitors of Penelope.
Bourne, Ella: Augustus as a letter-writer.
Tavenner, Eugene: The Roman farmer and the moon.
Steele, R. B.: The similes in Latin epic poetry.
Carnoy, A. J.: The real nature of dissimilation.
Lockwood, D. P.: Two thousand years of Latin translation from the Greek.
Brewster, E. H.: The synthesis of the Romans.

Hadzsits, G. D.: *Lucretius as a student of Roman religion.*
 Proceedings of the fiftieth annual meeting, New York, N. Y., 1918.
 Proceedings of the twentieth annual meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., 1918.

1919 — Volume L (Semi-Centennial)

Moore, F. G.: *A history of the American Philological Association.*
 Shorey, Paul: *Fifty years of classical philology in America.*
 Bloomfield, Maurice: *Fifty years of comparative philology in America.*
 Elmore, Jefferson: *The Philological Association of the Pacific Coast.*
 Kent, R. G.: *The Latin language in the fourth century.*
 Merrill, E. T.: *The Church in the fourth century.*
 Moore, C. H.: *The pagan reaction in the late fourth century.*
 Rolfe, J. C.: *Claudian.*
 Pease, A. S.: *The attitude of Jerome toward pagan literature.*
 Sage, E. T.: *The publication of Martial's poems.*
 Calhoun, G. M.: *Oral and written pleading in Athenian courts.*
 Proceedings of the fifty-first annual meeting, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1919.
 Proceedings of the twenty-first annual meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., 1919.
 Indices to Volumes XLI-L.

1920 — Volume LI

Prentice, W. K.: *Thermopylae and Artemisium.*
 Kent, R. G.: *The alleged conflict of the accents in Latin verse.*
 Rolfe, J. C.: *Prorsus.*
 Manning, C. A.: *The Tauric Maiden and allied cults.*
 Schmidt, Nathaniel: *Bellerophon's tablet and the Homeric question in the light of Oriental research.*
 Rand, E. K.: *Prudentius and Christian humanism.*
 Taylor, J. W.: *Gemistus Pletho as a moral philosopher.*
 McCartney, E. S.: *Spontaneous generation and kindred notions in antiquity.*
 Taylor, L. R.: *The worship of Augustus in Italy during his lifetime.*
 Van Hook, La Rue: *The exposure of infants at Athens.*
 Radford, R. S.: *The juvenile works of Ovid and the spondaic period of his metrical art.*
 Tanner, R. H.: *The 'Αρχιλοχος of Cratinus and Callias δ λακκόπλουτος.*
 Proceedings of the fifty-second annual meeting, Baltimore, Md., 1920.
 Proceedings of the twenty-second annual meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., 1920.

The *Proceedings* of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application to the Secretary until they are out of print.

Fifty reprints of articles in the *Transactions*, and twenty reprints

of abstracts in the *Proceedings*, are given to the authors for distribution. Additional copies are furnished at cost.

The "Transactions for" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state—not the year of publication, but rather—the year *for* which the *Transactions* are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table:—

The <i>Transactions</i> for 1869 and 1870 form Vol. I	The <i>Trans.</i> for 1896 form Vol. XXVII
The <i>Trans.</i> for 1871 " " II	" " 1897 " " XXVIII
" " 1872 " " III	" " 1898 " " XXIX
" " 1873 " " IV	" " 1899 " " XXX
" " 1874 " " V	" " 1900 " " XXXI
" " 1875 " " VI	" " 1901 " " XXXII
" " 1876 " " VII	" " 1902 " " XXXIII
" " 1877 " " VIII	" " 1903 " " XXXIV
" " 1878 " " IX	" " 1904 " " XXXV
" " 1879 " " X	" " 1905 " " XXXVI
" " 1880 " " XI	" " 1906 " " XXXVII
" " 1881 " " XII	" " 1907 " " XXXVIII
" " 1882 " " XIII	" " 1908 " " XXXIX
" " 1883 " " XIV	" " 1909 " " XL
" " 1884 " " XV	" " 1910 " " XLI
" " 1885 " " XVI	" " 1911 " " XLI
" " 1886 " " XVII	" " 1912 " " XLIII
" " 1887 " " XVIII	" " 1913 " " XLIV
" " 1888 " " XIX	" " 1914 " " XLV
" " 1889 " " XX	" " 1915 " " XLVI
" " 1890 " " XXI	" " 1916 " " XLVII
" " 1891 " " XXII	" " 1917 " " XLVIII
" " 1892 " " XXIII	" " 1918 " " XLIX
" " 1893 " " XXIV	" " 1919 " " L
" " 1894 " " XXV	" " 1920 " " LI
" " 1895 " " XXVI	" " 1921 " " LII

Volumes I—XXVII, XLVI, and XLVII can be secured in paper binding only; Volumes XXVIII—XXXVIII, and XXXIX—XLIII, in red cloth binding only; Volumes XLIV, XLV, and XLVIII, XLIX, and LI, in either paper or red cloth. The red cloth binding is one which the Association has used for almost twenty-five years for the convenience of its members.

The price of these volumes, bound in paper, is \$2.00 apiece, except Volumes XV, XX, XXIII, XXXII, XXXVI, XL, XLI, and XLIII—XLIX, for which \$2.50 is charged, and Volumes L—LII, the price of which is \$3.00. Where the cloth binding is ordered, fifty cents per volume

must be added to the above prices. Volumes **v**, **vi**, and **vii**, are out of print. A charge of fifty cents per copy is made for reprints of the indices to Volumes **XXXI–XL**; and seventy-five cents for the indices to Volumes **XLI–L**.

Odd volumes will be bound by F. J. Barnard & Co., 105 Federal Street, Boston, at a price to be quoted upon application.

Orders for the publications of the Association should be sent to the Secretary, Professor Clarence P. Bill, Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio. For prices, see above (pp. lxxi–lxxii).

9 3891

Princeton University Library



32101 076199221

32101 076199221

